

THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

THERE is in the churches a growing demand for purely expository preaching. So many people know so little of the Bible, and the religion of multitudes is so indefinite, that the very first duty of the pulpit, it is held, is to expound the actual content of Scripture. A service like that of the Church of England, with its fixed lectionary, lends itself easily to this. But in forms of worship in which the choice of lesson and topic is left to the minister the temptation is to preach from 'texts,' the more striking and unusual the better.

As an aid to the better way, a recent book by the Rev. H. F. B. MACKAY would be difficult to surpass. It is called *Some Studies in the New Testament* (Centenary Press; 6s. net). Mr. MACKAY has a considerable amount of expository work to his credit already, but his new book is outstanding as an example of the way in which a fresh mind can find and disclose interesting and suggestive things in narratives that are old and familiar. One excellent example is his treatment of the story of Ananias and Sapphira. They died, he contends, from shock. They were not supernaturally executed. They had not realized how horrible their sin was in the estimation of the early Christian community. It was the sudden revelation of this that overwhelmed them. They were suddenly up against the moral atmosphere of a body exalted by the spirit of Christ.

ever, is one with the heading 'The Christ of Experience,' based on 2 Co 5¹⁴⁻¹⁷, and we summarize it because it raises certain points of importance at the present time. St. Paul is sketching the ideal Christian community. He is showing the Corinthians a picture of their church as it ought to be and as it might be. And the notes, as he shows them in succession, are these. First, 'One died for all,' that is the first word of the gospel, acceptance of which is the first step towards the Christian life. But, secondly, this means a decision by the disciple, 'then all died.' The only meaning of the acceptance of the gospel message is that we die to the old way of living. Nothing else matters. The ideal Christian community has killed self as a motive and installed Christ in the centre as the motive and power for everything.

Therefore, thirdly, we don't think any more of 'Christ in the flesh,' the 'Jesus of history.' If any of us have known Jesus Christ in the old external way as a carpenter in Galilee, as a teacher in Jerusalem, we no longer think of Him as such. In Christ there has been a new creation, and the members of the ideal Christian community no longer judge at all after the flesh, do not any longer judge one another so, with an eye to idiosyncrasies, or race, or birth, or capacity, or station, or means, but solely as new creatures in Christ.

Think what this means. It shows how Jesus Christ was preached in the earliest church. Re-

member, this letter was written twenty-five years after the Ascension, and exhibits a Christian Church which has been founded and equipped for years, and has had time to get into difficulties. The earliest of the written Gospels was not written until fifteen years after this. There are hardly any biographical details about our Lord in the letters of Paul. This is deliberate. The heart of the Church's life was the crucified and risen Christ and the consequent reign of the Holy Spirit in the Church. The Baptismal Gate was the dying and rising again in Christ into a life in God.

The late Dr. Burkitt, Norrisian Professor of Divinity at Cambridge, asserted that the earliest picture of Jesus Christ, the picture which in the order of time precedes the Four Gospels, is not unfairly summarized in the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds. Then later come the written Gospels with their reminiscences of our Lord's adorable characteristics. Let nobody have a suspicion that Christianity developed out of an original Unitarianism into a belief in the deity of Christ. The criticism of the New Testament has made it clear that the history of Christianity is the exact reverse of this. The original Christian idea was that no title was too high to give, no homage too high to pay, to the Son of God. Those who became Christians experienced Jesus Christ in His Church.

That is why it became necessary towards the end of the first century to emphasize the full and true humanity of our Lord. Most of the converts were Gentiles who had been polytheists; this new doctrine of God made Him seem very awful to them. It became difficult for them to think that the Divine Son was really and truly Man. This was the providential moment for the emergence into universal prominence of the Four Gospels, and they are stamped with the Church's imprimatur as enshrining the true account of the manifestation on earth of her Divine Lord.

There is much sorrow to-day over the weakening of Christianity in England and over the fact that the English are ceasing to go to church. This is the result of the fact that the majority of English

children are not taught Christianity as the earliest Church was taught it. English schools do not focus the attention of their pupils, as the Apostles did, on the cardinal facts of the Creed, keeping back, as a second course, the captivating stories which survive of the sweetness and charm of our Lord's personality. It is a striking fact that, working from a purely historical and scientific standpoint, Professor Burkitt should have demonstrated in effect that the Apostles would have refused to put the Gospels into their pupils' hands until they had mastered the substance of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Ten Commandments.

We English fail to teach Christianity. In every congregation there is a large majority of adults who require to be taught the elements of Christianity from the beginning. 'This is the fault of the preachers. We have failed to exhibit the facts of Revelation to the people in proper scale and proportion. We have found it easier in our scrappy Sunday morning sermons to emphasize the charm and beauty of the earthly ministry than to emphasize the great saving facts. It is easier to speak of the application of wine and oil on the road to Jericho than of the application of the Precious Blood to sinners fallen by the way in daily life.'

The result is that it is the Jesus of the past who inspires the English, His moral beauty which captivates them, His noble sufferings which nerve them to nobler ways of living. But if this had been the earliest Christianity we should all be pagans to-day. The world was not converted by any of these things. The world was converted not by the Christ of yesterday but by the Christ of to-day, by finding and knowing a living Master who reigns to-day and all days in His Church, who gathers His children into His arms and in the Eucharist feeds them with His own life. At this moment fathers and mothers who are earnest Christians themselves are quite satisfied if they find that at the horribly expensive preparatory school to which they have sent their little boy he is given occasional 'Bible lessons.' These are the people who are destroying English Christianity.

Preaching from the credal text, 'He suffered under Pontius Pilate,' the Rev. James Alan MONTGOMERY, D.D., Ph.D., Professor in the University of Pennsylvania, considers the subject of *The Christian Creed and History*. His sermon is one of the Hale Memorial series published by the Seabury-Western Theological Seminary, Evanston, Illinois (25 cents).

The question is asked at the outset: What is the place of this purely secular, political statement in the Christian Articles of Belief? The answer is that it is indicative of the truth that Christianity is an historical religion. We might have expected an expression of religious rancour, like 'betrayed by the Jews.' But no, the Passion of Christ is stated in terms of world-history.

Of course, all religions are objectively historical in the sense that they are phenomena of history. But on examination distinctions emerge. On the one hand, there are religions without a history, ranging all the way from the so-called primitive religions down to religions like that of Greece, whose history is mythology and the gods the *dramatis personæ*. On the other hand, there are religions tracing back to an historical founder, based on and propagated by sacred books. But these again separate into those without and those with a historic consciousness.

Gautama Buddha was an historical character and can be dated with fair exactness; but, like his India, he possessed no historical consciousness; and his religion, like all of India's thought, belongs to timeless eternity. Zoroaster developed indeed a panorama of historical cycles; but he was concerned with the eternal conflict of good and evil, and it is perhaps significant that there is wide divergence among scholars as to his date.

Of the three religions of historical character that remain, Islam is also unhistorical in its fundamental consciousness. The Koran is as history a jumble of odd historical facts, legends, and fables drawn from all quarters. It is not accidental that the Arab traditionalists and historians began their

dating with the year one of the Flight (A.D. 622); for them there was no history prior to that date.

The Jews, on the other hand, dated and still date from the creation of the world. A current English Jewish journal published in New York is dated 5695; and only very slowly did the Christian Church begin to date by years of the Lord. Thus, over against its peers and rivals in religious history, the Bible, with its Old Testament as the sacred book of Judaism, with the Old and the New Testaments authoritative for the Christian Church, is primarily a historical deposit. And this deposit is the basis of its belief.

The doctrine of the Incarnation as climax of an historical process is the new thing in the Christian religion. But notice that the Word which became flesh is linked up with the Creation story in the first chapter of Genesis: 'In the beginning was the word; all things were made through him.' The Word is the key to the history of Creation and the human race. If we date by *anno domini*, we do so because there has now been revealed the key and explanation of all that came before.

Thus history is not only a part but the peculiar *differentia* of the Christian Creed. That Creed begins with some general theistic statements about the one Creator-God; it concludes with beliefs and hopes common to higher religions concerning divine inspiration, religious fellowship, and life after death. But the great central portion of it deals with a phenomenon in history, namely, the birth, life, death, and triumph of a man who was Son of God Incarnate. It is not an idle or superfluous statement that declares Him to have 'suffered under Pontius Pilate.' It integrates Him into the very chronology of human history.

An unusually frank and courageous treatment of the difficulties raised by the doctrine of the Holy Spirit is supplied by Principal H. Maldwyn HUGHES, M.A., D.D., in his valuable book, *The Christian Idea of God* (Duckworth; 5s. net). Even

more welcome are the tentative suggestions he puts forward to meet perplexities widely felt, but not often confessed as such.

Dr. HUGHES thinks that perhaps the main solvent of the traditional doctrine of the Trinity is 'the prevalent uncertainty as to the meaning of the Holy Spirit.' He reminds us that many to-day tend to identify the Spirit with the Living Christ, and that 'it is becoming increasingly clear that there is room to doubt whether in the New Testament the Holy Spirit is regarded as a distinct hypostasis.'

Some, he says, who repudiate the traditional doctrine of the Trinity are Trinitarians on philosophical grounds; others are content to accept the Trinity of Revelation, without further inquiry; others, again, claim that the doctrine can be confessed because it safeguards the Christlikeness of God, without necessarily accepting the traditional distinction of persons. Besides these three classes there are the orthodox and those who interpret the doctrine in a Tritheistic or a Sabellian sense.

That Dr. HUGHES has correctly diagnosed the existing situation can hardly be denied. How has the position come about? The answer can only be that the need for formulating a doctrine of the Holy Spirit was not at first realized, and that, when it was realized, the New Testament data were found to be difficult of interpretation. Of the difficulty there can be no doubt, for sometimes the Spirit appears to be spoken of as a Person and sometimes as a manifestation of God or of Christ.

Dr. HUGHES sees the need for constructive thinking, and he knows where the process should begin. It should begin with the conception, clearly presented by Augustine, of the Holy Spirit 'as the indwelling Power of God in the genesis, maintenance, and consummation of the Christian life.' 'May it not be,' he asks, 'that speculatively the Holy Spirit is to be regarded as the Godhead (Father and Son) immanent in or indwelling men?' 'To the Christian (and only to the Christian),' he adds,

'this means God immanent with all the meaning and moral content of Jesus Christ.'

Dr. HUGHES does not object to the adjective 'personal' as applied to the Holy Spirit, or to the use of *homoousios*, but he doubts if the Spirit can be called 'Person' in the same sense as the other Two. He thinks, however, that 'this is simply a matter of words,' and that 'without straining the truth' we may still speak of the Holy Trinity, 'for the immanent activity of the Father and the Son is an essential element in the Christian doctrine of the Godhead.' 'On this line of interpretation, the Godhead consists of the Father and the Son, whose personal indwelling in men is known as the Holy Spirit. It would seem therefore that those are right who speak of the Holy Spirit as "proceeding from the Father and the Son," or "from the Father through the Son."'

Not so very long ago, as years count, such boldness of statement would have called for disciplinary inquiry. Earlier still, it would have meant prison and perhaps the stake. To-day, however, we are less certain that truth is advanced by violence. We believe rather that blows prove nothing and that violent words are a confession of defeat. It follows, therefore, that readers who do not like Dr. HUGHES' views must meet them by solid argument.

We must confess that opponents of such views face a stern task. Little is achieved by a mere insistence on the traditional teaching of the Church, important as this undoubtedly is. It is necessary to come to terms with the New Testament. What is the meaning of the Synoptic data, and how are we to estimate the evidence supplied by the Acts of the Apostles? What are we to make of St. Paul's approximation of the idea of the Holy Spirit to that of the living, indwelling Christ? How are we to interpret the sayings in Jn 14-16? It is for the objector to say.

Meantime, Dr. HUGHES claims solid advantages for his line of approach. It 'meets the philo-

sophical necessities which indicate that God is not a solitary monad, but lives in the activity of eternal fellowship.' It 'conserves the values of the Catholic christology.' It 'gives us a rich and intelligible doctrine of the Holy Spirit.' Finally, 'it gives us a doctrine of the Trinity which is in no danger of lapsing into either Tritheism or Sabellianism.' 'To this it may be worth while

adding that it is in harmony with the Apostles' and Nicene Creeds, and is (verbally at least) not out of harmony with the Athanasian Creed.' In these opinions, so boldly and yet so reverently put, there is material for a first-class theological debate which would be much more than an academic exercise, since the interests at stake are deeply religious as well as intellectual.

Some Outstanding Old Testament Problems.

VII. The Early Post-Exilic Community.

BY THE REVEREND PREBENDARY W. O. E. OESTERLEY, D.D., LITT.D., UNIVERSITY OF LONDON.

THE post-exilic community consisted, strictly speaking, of six different communities, namely, (1) the descendants of the Israelites who were deported to Assyria, living, however, in different centres, after the fall of Samaria in 721 B.C.; (2) the descendants of the Israelites who were left in their land after the fall of Samaria, and who, according to 2 K 17²⁴, were joined by aliens from various parts of the Assyrian empire; (3) those, and their descendants, who were left in Judæa after the fall of Jerusalem and the deportations to Babylonia in 597, 586, and 581 B.C.; (4) the exiles who returned from Babylonia to Palestine in 538 B.C.; (5) the Jews who remained in Babylonia, preferring to remain there though the decree of Cyrus permitted their return; and (6) those, whether from the north or south of Palestine, or both, who settled in different centres in Egypt.

The period with which we shall be mainly concerned is from the eve of the Exile to the early years of the fourth century B.C.; and we shall be dealing only with those of the seed of Israel comprised under (2), (3), (4) above.

The period in question is of great importance, since it was during this century, or century and a half, that Judaism, as it existed during New Testament times, began to take shape and to assume its definite form; religious questions of deepest import for the future of Israel were in the balance.

The historical problem consists, as a matter of fact, of several related problems. The first which confronts us centres in the different, and sometimes contradictory, data offered in the available sources.

As to what these sources are opinions differ; we shall, however, restrict ourselves to those in regard to which there is general agreement; they are these: Is 40-66, Haggai, Zechariah, Ezra, Nehemiah, Ruth, Malachi, some of the later Psalms, 1 Esdras (the 'Greek Ezra'), a few of the Elephantine papyri, and Josephus, *Antiq.*, Bk. xi.

The nature of this first problem will be grasped in the light of the following observations.

The return of the exiles from the Babylonian captivity took place in the first year of Cyrus becoming king of Babylonia, *i.e.* 538 B.C. What was the reason of their return? The question is not superfluous, for, in the first place, many of the exiles, perhaps the majority, did not return; there is both Biblical and extra-Biblical evidence to show that this was the case; moreover, our sources are not in agreement on the point. In Ezr 1²⁻⁴ (the decree of Cyrus) it is specifically stated that the purpose of the Return was that the Temple might be rebuilt. But according to the prophecy in Jer 29¹⁰, the Return had for its object simply and naturally the coming home again of the exiles to the land of their fathers; and, more important, in accordance with this, it is significant that in Deutero-Isaiah, which is so full of the thoughts of the Return, and where Zion and Jerusalem are again and again spoken of (41²⁷ 44²⁶ 45¹³ 48²³. 24 49¹⁴⁻²¹ 51¹⁶ 52⁷⁻¹⁰ 54¹⁻⁴), there is never any mention of the purpose of the Return being to rebuild the Temple; in the one passage where this is referred to (44²⁸) the text is clearly out of order. This first point of difference in our sources will arise again as we proceed.

The next difficulty is concerned with differences in the sources regarding the actual rebuilding of the Temple. When did this take place? From what has just been said there is, at any rate, some justification for the contention that the thought of the rebuilding of the Temple had nothing to do with the Return; indeed, we may ask, why should there have been any such thought? For more than a generation the exiles had worshipped without offering sacrifices; most of them had never known what it was to worship in a temple, and could not, therefore, have felt the want of it; they had learned, and had become accustomed to, a spiritual form of worship. It is, therefore, fully comprehensible that when the exiles returned to Palestine there was no thought of rebuilding the Temple. Not until they had been settled down for seventeen years was this taken in hand. The sources do not, however, agree upon this point. According to Ezr 3⁸⁻¹³ the foundation for the rebuilding of the Temple was laid in the second month of the second year after the Return, *i.e.* 537 B.C., which was the second year of Cyrus as King of Babylonia. But in Hag 1^{1, 15} it is said that the work of rebuilding the Temple was begun in the sixth month of the second year of Darius I., *i.e.* 520 B.C.

When we ask, again, under whose inspiration and guidance the rebuilding of the Temple was undertaken, we find the sources once more at variance. In Ezr 3^{2, 8, 4^{2, 3}} it is made clear that Jeshua and Zerubbabel take the lead in this; in Ezr 5¹⁶, on the other hand, it is said that Sheshbazzar 'laid the foundations of the house of God which is in Jerusalem.' But with both these varying statements the books of Haggai and Zechariah disagree, for in these it is abundantly clear that the real incentive for the rebuilding of the Temple is to be found in the work of these two prophets.

All authorities are agreed that these two books offer more reliable historical *data* than the book of Ezra; we may therefore accept the year 520 B.C. as that in which the rebuilding of the Temple was begun, and Haggai and Zechariah as those to whom this was due. But these two books give no indication as to when the building was completed; for this we must turn to Ezra, for there is no reason to doubt the reliability of what is said in 6¹⁵: 'And this house was finished on the third day of the month Adar, which was in the sixth year of the reign of Darius the king,' *i.e.* 516 B.C.

We have now a further difficulty to consider; it is concerned with the question as to who the builders of the Temple were; at first sight this may appear

a very unimportant matter, not worth troubling about; but it will be seen that ultimately a good deal turns upon it. In Ezr 4^{1ff.} it is said that the building of the Temple was undertaken by 'the children of the captivity,' *i.e.* the returned exiles (cf. also 3^{8ff.}), and it is only after they have started the building that the 'adversaries of Judah and Benjamin' come and say: 'Let us build with you . . .'; but they are repulsed with the words: 'Ye have nothing to do with us to build an house unto our God. . .'. By the 'adversaries' are meant 'the people of the land' (v.⁴), who are elsewhere spoken of as 'the heathen of the land' (Ezr 6²¹, Neh 5¹⁷), and 'the children of the foreigner' (Neh 9²); in other words, they are the people, living both in northern and southern Palestine, who had been left in the land (they or their descendants) after the various deportations had taken place. In both Ezra and Nehemiah these people are spoken of as a mixed race and as not being true worshippers of Jahweh; hence, in these two books they are regarded as unfit to take part in the rebuilding of this Temple which the returned exiles had taken in hand. Now, in both Haggai and Zechariah, things are represented in a different light. In Hag 1^{2ff.} the prophet urges that the rebuilding of the Temple should be undertaken; but he addresses himself not to the returned exiles, but to the people generally: 'This people say, It is not the time for us to come, the time for Yahweh's house to be built'; and the prophet bids the people go and gather wood for the building. *They*, therefore, take the initiative after the prophet's words. It is after this that we read that 'the remnant of the people,' *i.e.* the returned exiles, 'came and did work in the house of Yahweh of hosts, their God' (1¹⁴). But, in addition to this, we find that the distinction between the 'people of the land' and the returned exiles, so emphasized in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, is not recognized by either Haggai or Zechariah. In Hag 1^{4ff., 13ff.} both bodies are indiscriminately urged to undertake the building, and there is no hint of the 'people of the land' being hostile to the returned exiles, or in any way hindering the work; nor does the prophet recognize any racial or religious distinction between them. And the same is true of Zechariah; he addresses 'all the people of the land and the priests' (7⁵), warning them and exhorting them (8^{ff., 8ff.}), as one body.

These various points, then, constitute the first part of the historical problem of the early post-exilic community. Our brief survey has so far covered the period dating from the year of the

Return 538 B.C., to that of the completion of the Temple, 516 B.C. For a long time after this our sources give us no certain dates. It is in Ezr 7^{7, 8} that we get our next date; here it is said Ezra (see v.¹) 'came to Jerusalem in the fifth month, which was in the seventh year of the king'; in the previous verse the name of the king is given as Artaxerxes; but it is not said which of the Persian kings of this name is meant; there were three, but the first two only can come into consideration here; the first of this name reigned 464-424 B.C.; the second 404-358 B.C. If the former is meant, his seventh year was 457 B.C., if the latter 397 B.C. Once more, we get another precise date in Neh 2¹; this time it is in reference to Nehemiah, who obtained permission from the king to go to Judah (v.⁵) in 'the twentieth year of Artaxerxes the king.' But again it is not said which Artaxerxes is meant; if the first of the name, the date is 444 B.C.; if the second, 384 B.C. It will thus be seen that there is a gap of over seventy years in the history. Neither Ezra nor Nehemiah gives us any information of what happened during all these years, at any rate information which can be relied upon. The important question, therefore, arises as to whether any information is to be gathered from our other sources. To this we shall have to return; but our first concern must be with Ezra and Nehemiah, who now come before us. For reasons which will, we hope, ultimately be seen to be important, we must begin by seeking to show that Nehemiah preceded Ezra as a leader of the people, and not *vice versa*; this will involve some little detailed discussion, but the whole subject is a necessary preliminary to some final conclusions which will be set forth in due course.

The usual view, based of course upon the records contained in the books of Ezra and Nehemiah, is that Ezra arrived in Palestine and worked there for thirteen years, after which Nehemiah joined him, and together they continued in the work of leadership, with all that this involved. This envisagement of the state of affairs is derived from the passages already referred to, in which dates referring to the reign of the King Artaxerxes are given; but, as we have seen, it is not stated which King Artaxerxes is meant. It is assumed, as probably the editor of the books of Ezra and Nehemiah intended it to be assumed, that in each case the king was Artaxerxes I. According to these passages, therefore, Ezra arrived in Palestine in 457 B.C., and Nehemiah followed him in 444 B.C. We have already had some reason for doubting the historical reliability of the editor of the books of

Ezra and Nehemiah; if, in each case of his mention of Artaxerxes, he meant the first of the name, which seems likely, but which is not certain, then we shall have further cause for thinking that his knowledge of history was defective—unless, indeed, he had some reason in distorting historical facts. The first point to note is that, according to these two books, Ezra and Nehemiah are represented as sole leaders, and yet as contemporaries; this, in itself, is improbable, for Nehemiah is spoken of as governor in Judah in Neh 5¹⁴, while, according to Ezr 7^{25, 26}, Ezra occupies a similar office; there cannot have been two governors of Judah at the same time. Another matter which is likewise self-contradictory is while both are mentioned as co-operating, yet on the important question of the mixed marriages they act independently; such a thing is unthinkable if they were contemporaries.

Again, it is a significant fact that just in the two important passages in which Ezra and Nehemiah are represented as co-operating, the text is uncertain. Those passages are Neh 8⁹ and 10¹. In the first of these we read: 'And Nehemiah, which was the Tirshatha, and Ezra the priest the scribe, and the Levites that taught the people . . .', then follows the great ceremony of the reading of the Law; one has only to read this chapter to see that the one person of importance is Ezra; his name occurs six times, that of Nehemiah in this verse only; even the Levites are mentioned three times; is it likely that if Nehemiah had actually co-operated with Ezra on this solemn occasion his name would have been so ignored? Even the Levites play a more important part than he does. But Nehemiah was not a teacher; this chapter is universally recognized as not being part of his memoirs; and he was not a contemporary of Ezra's. His name in this passage is an insertion, as is proved by the corresponding passage in the 'Greek Ezra,' where it does not occur. In Neh 10¹, where mention is made of 'Nehemiah, the Tirshatha,' there is a difference between the Hebrew and the Greek texts—a small difference, it is true, the latter omitting 'the Tirshatha'; but that the text is uncertain is again significant. One other passage must be mentioned, Neh 12²⁶; this verse sums up the preceding chronological list of the priests and Levites who returned to Palestine from the time of Zerubbabel onwards, three generations, viz. 'in the days of Joiakim the son of Jeshua, the son of Jozadak,' first generation; 'in the days of Nehemiah the governor,' second generation; 'and of Ezra the priest the scribe,' third generation. Even if we had no other evidence, this passage

shows conclusively that Nehemiah preceded Ezra. A minor point may be mentioned, in passing: in his memoirs Nehemiah deplores the smallness of the population in his day, saying: 'the city was wide and large; but the people were few therein, and the houses were not builded' (Neh 7⁴); from Ezra's memoirs, on the other hand, we find that there has been a great increase in the population: 'Now while Ezra prayed . . . there was gathered together unto him out of Israel a very great congregation of men, women, and children' (10¹), and in v. 23 it says that 'the people are many.' To whatever this increase may have been due, it is clear that conditions had changed—a further indication that Ezra and Nehemiah cannot have been contemporaries.

Again, from Nehemiah's memoirs we know that when he arrived in Jerusalem he found the walls of the city in a precarious state; he says that he went out by night 'and viewed the walls of Jerusalem which were broken down, and the gates thereof were consumed with fire . . . then I said unto them, Ye see the evil case that we are in, how Jerusalem lieth waste, and the gates thereof are burned with fire; come and let us build up the wall of Jerusalem that we be no more a reproach' (Neh 2¹²⁻¹⁷). But on turning to Ezra's memoirs we find that the wall is in perfect condition: 'For we are bondmen; yet our God hath not forsaken us in our bondage, but hath extended mercy unto us in the sight of the kings of Persia, to give us a reviving, to set up the house of our God, and to repair the ruins thereof, and to give us a wall in Judah, even in Jerusalem' (Ezr 9⁹); the Hebrew word used for 'wall' shows that it cannot be understood in a figurative sense. This, again, is but a small point, but it adds its quota to the evidence showing that Ezra and Nehemiah were not contemporaries.

We have seen that, according to Neh 12²⁶, Nehemiah returned to Jerusalem at least a generation before Ezra; this is borne out by other passages in our sources. Neh 3¹, which belongs to Nehemiah's memoirs, tells us that among those who took part in assisting Nehemiah to build the walls of Jerusalem was the high priest Eliashib; Nehemiah, therefore, lived under the high priesthood of Eliashib. Now, from Ezr 10⁶ we learn that Ezra lived under the high priesthood of Jehohanan (abbreviated, Johanan, which is only another form of Jonathan, see Neh 12^{10, 11, 22}); in this verse Jehohanan is spoken of as 'the son of Eliashib'; but, as elsewhere in the Old Testament (Gn 29⁵ 31^{28, 48}, Ru 4¹⁷), 'son' is used loosely for

'grandson'; in the present case this comes out clearly from Neh 12²⁸: 'and Eliashib begat Joiada, and Joiada begat Jonathan.' It follows, therefore, that Nehemiah lived under the high priesthood of Eliashib, while Ezra lived under that of his grandson Jonathan or Jehohanan. This is further corroborated by extra-Biblical evidence, namely, by two of the Elephantine papyri. Nearly all of these are dated; on two of them mention is made of a letter having been sent by the Jewish priests in Yeb (= Elephantine) to 'Johanan the high priest and his colleagues the priests who are in Jerusalem'; these were written in the year 408 B.C.; this was the high priest, as we have seen, under whom Ezra lived. A similar letter, of the same date, was sent to the sons of Sanballat, the governor of Samaria, Delaiah, and Shelemiah. As Sanballat was governor during the time of Nehemiah (Neh 2¹⁰ 4¹ 6¹ etc.), he was an old man by now; hence, presumably, the letter was sent to his sons, who were acting for him.

From what has been said, then, it is evident that the Artaxerxes mentioned in Neh 2¹, the first of this name, must be understood; his twentieth year was 444 B.C., and it was in this year that Nehemiah came to Jerusalem; and the Artaxerxes mentioned in Ezr 7^{7, 8} is the second of this name; his seventh year was 397 B.C., and it was in this year that Ezra came to Jerusalem.

Nehemiah remained in Jerusalem for twelve years when he returned to the king; but soon after this he received permission again to go to Jerusalem (Neh 13^{6, 7}); how long he remained is not said. Ezra, presumably, remained permanently in Jerusalem; but when his activity ceased, or when he died, we are not told.

All that is recorded of Nehemiah during his first sojourn in Jerusalem is concerned with the building of the walls. In this work he met with a good deal of opposition from two quarters. The Samaritans under the leadership of their governor, Sanballat, did their best to hinder the building. No reason is given why Sanballat was opposed to this; but it is reasonable to suppose that he resented the presence of Nehemiah because he hoped that Judaea might have come under his jurisdiction; that would, at any rate, account for the bitter personal animosity he had for Nehemiah. Apart from that, however, Sanballat may well have regarded a fortified city as a possible source of danger. More insidious was the opposition which Nehemiah encountered on the part of Jews living in Jerusalem; the reason for this is made clear; a considerable section of the Jews were on the best

of terms with the Samaritans; they had no wish to keep the Samaritans out, and the building of the walls would, they held rightly, be regarded as an unfriendly act. On the other hand, there was a strong party of the Jews whose loyalty to Nehemiah was unquestioned; and it was with their help that the walls were ultimately rebuilt. It is of importance to note the existence of two parties among the Jews; and the narrative makes it clear that the two parties did not merely represent, respectively, the 'people of the land' and the returned exiles; the mixed marriages question shows this.

During Nehemiah's first stay in Jerusalem, then, he was concerned solely with secular affairs; this was natural enough when it is remembered that he did not profess to be a religious teacher, and that he was cup-bearer to the king and, as the Septuagint of 11¹¹ shows, an official in the royal harem. On his second visit however, Nehemiah, occupied himself with matters concerning the Law; we may surmise that this was due to pressure on the part of the more rigidly orthodox Jewish leaders in Babylon. We read of his cleansing of a chamber within the Temple precincts which had been occupied by the Samaritan Tobiah; this chamber had been used for storing up offerings for the Temple worship, and for keeping the perquisites of the Levites (Neh 13⁴); Nehemiah was, therefore, fully justified in restoring this chamber to its proper use. His other activities were concerned with enforcing the due

payment of tithe, with the more rigid observance of the Sabbath, and with an effort to put an end to marriages between Jews and non-Israelite women.

The work of Ezra was that of a religious reformer, and was concentrated on enforcing the observance of the Law in accordance with the strict orthodoxy of Babylonian Judaism. He is significantly spoken of as 'Ezra the priest, the scribe, even the scribe of the words of the commandments of the Lord, and of his statutes to Israel' (Ezr 7¹¹); 'Ezra the priest, the scribe of the law of the God of heaven' (7²¹; cf. Neh 8¹⁻⁴). The nature of his work is amply illustrated in Ezr 8-10 and Neh 8-10 (it is difficult to believe that any of these last belong to Nehemiah's memoirs). That the records of his work are less full of incident than those which describe that of Nehemiah is easily accounted for when one remembers what the essence of that work was; this is clearly indicated in Ezr 7¹⁰: 'For Ezra had set his heart to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgements,' so also v.²⁸; in the duty of the continuous carrying out of this work of teaching there could obviously not be much to record; there was no occasion for exciting episodes such as Nehemiah experienced; as a priest and a scribe Ezra was not a man of action in the sense that Nehemiah was. But his work was of a far more enduring character than that of Nehemiah.

(To be continued.)

Literature.

THE PARABLES.

To the common man the parables of Jesus are *par excellence* examples of the simplicity of His teaching, in beautiful and memorable words. To the modern theologian they offer baffling problems of interpretation. Professor Dodd's brilliant little book on *The Parables of the Kingdom* (Nisbet; 7s. 6d. net) leads swiftly to the heart of many of these difficulties with an engaging combination of minute erudition and evangelical fervour and fearless readiness for the exercise of critical freedom.

The masterly introduction is charming as it describes the development of the pictorial expression, or living metaphor, into simile or story-parable. A hint of difficulties to come is given in

the allusion to the results of form-criticism which often loosens the parables from the setting given in the Gospels; and in the questioning note put against the interpretations added on to parables by the Evangelists. If two different applications of the same parable are offered in Scripture, one conclusion must be that the early tradition was not sure which was correct. But Jesus Himself must have known exactly what He meant. If the key, then, is to be found to the difficulties thus raised, it must evidently be sought by asking what was the exact practical point and application Jesus meant the parable to have in the setting in which it was spoken.

So far the book reads easily. And the concluding chapter recovers the same limpid clarity as it sums

up the result attained by regarding parables strictly in the light of the conception of the Kingdom of God as something which has come and created a crisis and demanded an immediate decision. The point of the Sower is that now the field has a harvest ripe, of the Mustard-seed that the bush is now ready for birds to lodge in it, of the Talents that the nation must fling legalistic caution aside and go 'all out' for the universal mission.

Very beautifully Professor Dodd adds that the Eucharistic service ought to be a re-living in the experience of the communicant of the crisis of the coming of the Kingdom, the Holy Communion thus doing for him what preaching tries to do for the unconverted. And finally he remarks that the reality and purpose of history is just to bring men face to face with eternal issues so that they may here and now enter upon a blessedness that will, however, be fulfilled only in the eternal order.

The middle of the book is harder going. The first business is to refuse the term 'Kingdom of God.' The emphasis is, of course, not on the Kingdom itself as an organization but on its being God's and not another's rule, and the proclamation of Jesus is not that it will come soon or some day or at last, but that it has come and is now here. This is the specific difference in Jesus' use of the term. The time was, therefore, one of crisis. The fall of the nation, Jesus' own death, His resurrection, the new age of righteousness are all at hand because the Kingdom has come and it brings these events. That this was Jesus' outlook and message gives the clue to the point of each parable.

Armed with this key, Professor Dodd glances with an almost contemptuous pity at the way the Evangelists fumble with Jesus' allusion to salt. Surely the one possible point of it is that the Jews were a failure in their missionary vocation. In the parables about watching or waking he would see practical warnings to the disciples not to be caught (as at last they were) unprepared.

On numerous points of detail readers may reserve judgment, but for the book as a whole there can be nothing but gratitude and admiration. It leaves a clear deposit in the mind and is a refreshing revelation that it is possible for one operating with the idea of crisis nevertheless to make a luminous and coherent contribution to thought.

It is doubtless too soon to say whether 'crisis' is more than the latest catchword, 'eschatology' having had its day, or whether it is at last the great word that will open the seven seals. On the one hand, there is the fact that as a world movement either extensively or intensively, Christianity seems

at an *impasse*. Is this perhaps because it has lost the fundamental sense of crisis which was its life? In a religion that professes to determine issues so great is not a sense of crisis the only thing that will keep it alive and real? Christians blame themselves. Must the tradition bear part of the blame? Is it necessary to get back behind even the Gospel records to recover the baptism of fire? Yet, on the other hand, if the tradition has made of many words of Jesus quiet generalizations about faith and virtue, may it not have been that this element was always in them? One would say naturally that 'Come unto me, and I will give you rest' pictures not a crisis but a consummation. Were there not meek souls to whom He addressed words of encouragement and peace and to whom He gave simple counsels for the daily path?

FROM CHRIST TO CONSTANTINE.

The Professor of Ecclesiastical History in a Scots Divinity Faculty was expected if not required to deal competently with at least two vital periods—the Ancient Church and the Reformation. Dr. James Mackinnon is alone in publishing volumes which treat of both periods with the same thoroughness, the same evidence of almost exhaustive scholarly research, the same massive learning. His four volumes on 'Luther and the Reformation' are matched by his trilogy on the early days of Christianity. It is a notable performance; and one's admiration merges into astonishment when one sets alongside those the three volumes on 'Modern Liberty.' We can scarcely recall another recent example of the like combination of encyclopædic and specialized knowledge.

We welcome this last volume—*From Christ to Constantine* (Longmans; 18s. net)—because it so richly compensates whatever defects might be found in its two predecessors in the trilogy—'The Historic Jesus' and 'The Gospel in the Early Church.' In the first in particular Dr. Mackinnon was on very debatable ground, where little valuable fruit is likely to be gathered by one who is primarily and almost all the way a scientific historian. In this latest volume Dr. Mackinnon's real gifts can be exercised to worthy purpose, and he has given us a real contribution in the form, as he defines it, of 'a reasoned and critical survey of the evolution of the Early Church.'

The material is well arranged and the treatment is very clear. Beginning with an estimate of the Græco-Roman world, he passes to the planting, the growth and life, of the primitive Christian com-

munities. Next comes Gentile Christianity and the germinal Universal Church. Then we have an illuminating discussion of the relations of the Empire and the Church, and Church government. In the fifth part, which strikes us as perhaps the best, we have described the clear emergence of the Catholic Church and the Roman primacy, along with the beginnings of Catholic orthodoxy against heresies and Gnosticism. Lastly, we have the dramatic story of the conversion of the Empire.

Every part is well balanced and fully documented. Although 'purple patches' are totally lacking, and little brilliance of style can be found, the book is very readable, and a wider public than students of divinity will peruse it with interest and profit.

THE TRACTARIANS.

In *Magdalen Studies* (S.P.C.K. ; 12s. 6d. net) we have an account of 'Ten Good Men' by Mr. R. D. Middleton, M.A. They were bound together by a common loyalty to Magdalen College, and by a common devotion to the ideal which received more or less true expression in the Tractarian Movement. Their names are Martin Joseph Routh, John Rouse Bloxam, Frederick Bulley, William Palmer, Roundell Palmer, James Bowling Mozley, Henry Best, Richard Waldo Sibthorp, Bernard Smith, and Henry Ramsden Bramley. Some of them left the Church of England and went over, as did John Henry Newman, to the Church of Rome. In every case Mr. Middleton has given us a careful, fully documented paper, based on a diligent investigation of the literary sources.

Perhaps the most familiar of those ten names is that of James Bowling Mozley, whose theological writings commended him to a wide public. He was on intimate relations with John Henry Newman and much distressed by the latter's renunciation of his Anglican Orders. This and many other points are admirably brought out in Mr. Middleton's 'Studies,' an attractive feature of which to many will be their publication of letters of Newman and Mozley which have not hitherto been accessible in printed form.

Newman kept his own counsel, and his friends were at a loss to know whether he would remain in the Church of England or eventually become a convert to Romanism. Bernard Smith, who had gone over to Rome, paid a visit of inquiry at Oxford, and on his return to Oscott reported to Dr. Wiseman that Newman would be coming soon. He had known Newman for nearly ten years and

his strictness as to clerical costume, and gathered solely from the fact of Newman wearing grey trousers that he no longer regarded himself as being in Holy Orders !

MACDOUGALL AND FREUD.

From time to time in our columns the remark has been made that the claims of psychology to be a science are disputable and indeed disputed. Every one has a vague feeling that the old psychology is discredited lumber. Many feel that the new psychology is rather filthy-minded charlatanism, guilty of nearly all the fallacies of reasoning from 'begging the question' to 'reasoning in a circle' by way of an 'undistributed middle,' prone overmuch to mal-observation and to generalization as to normal behaviour from consideration of a few pathological cases.

Professor William McDougall's new book, *Psycho-Analysis and Social Psychology* (Methuen ; 7s. 6d. net), is designed partly to induce a more hopeful view. The distinguished author knows the pass or impasse to which psychology has come and is concerned about it. He appeals for joint effort on the part of 'academic' and 'new' psychologists to bring psychology to its rightful place and justify its claim to be truly a science. He on his part grants freely that Freud and his followers have attained results of assured value. He asks them frankly to abandon what in his later writings Freud does abandon—the idea that normal individuals are all subject to the 'Oedipus-complex,' which it has been held is fundamental to and explanatory of nearly all human behaviour and all man's social, artistic, and religious activities. Let that stupid ill-based assumption go, and the new psychology may contribute much of real value. Very impressively the author points to the moral and social chaos which Freudianism, or a facile misunderstanding of what Freud means, is working most markedly in America, where perils of repression have become so feared that parents are afraid to exercise any discipline, and young people identify 'self-expression' with licence and sexual promiscuity ; and where fear of the 'Oedipus-complex' has led parents to dread showing any natural affection for their offspring.

JEWISH CHRISTIANITY

It is common knowledge that numerically and qualitatively Jewish converts to Christianity take premier place among all converts from non-Christian

religion; so we doubt if Mr. Hugh J. Schonfield is quite justified in his contention that historians of Christianity have failed to do justice to the importance of Jewish Christians. To fill what he considers a gap he has written *The History of Jewish Christianity from the First to the Twentieth Century* (Duckworth; 7s. 6d. net). For a thousand years after the early Christian centuries, Jewish Christians were simply merged in the Gentile Church. It may be said that both Jews and the Church compelled this. To all intents and purposes a Christian Jew became a Gentile. Many beside Mr. Schonfield recognize that this in many ways is unfortunate. He points out that in the beginning it was not so; the Jewish-Christian Church was not lost in the Gentile-Christian Church; and he holds it should not be so now. He seems to desire a restoration of the state of matters recognized by Ac 15; let there be two churches, one for Christian Jews who will keep their ancestral customs, maintain the Unity of God, and acknowledge the Messiahship of Jesus.

The difficulties involved are surely obvious to all but Mr. Schonfield. The old Ebionites tried it and disappeared. So far as the doctrines of God and Christ are concerned, the Socinians tried it, and have ended in Unitarianism with a purely human Jesus. Will a third attempt be more successful?

In his account of the early Jewish Church the author to some extent follows Eisler, whose views have met with devastating criticism; and in his attitude to St. Paul he plainly wobbles.

How he can say that the Council of Jerusalem 'happily settled' the problem of Jew and Gentile in the Church passes comprehension. Surely, too, his opinion that normal Christianity has surrendered, to its great loss, the doctrine of the Messiah, is groundless; what Church does not proclaim the Kingship of Christ?

THE RUSSIAN SOUL

Fedor Stepun is one of the ablest exiled Russians and has had a remarkable personal history. He served in the Russian forces in the Great War; on the fall of the Tsar he sympathized with Kerensky, but occupied several responsible positions under the Bolshevik Government. Finally he fell under suspicion and was exiled to Germany, where at present he holds a Lectureship. One of his best works was published in German in 1934, 'Das Antlitz Russlands und das Gesicht der Revolution.' It has been translated by Erminie Huntress as *The Russian Soul and Revolution* (Scribner's; 6s. net). It is an

analysis, not a history; it is an attempt to let Western peoples see Russia in revolution through Russian eyes. It answers the question—how did Marxism find its flowering among a people who at the opening of the Revolution were not 'capitalistic' in the Western sense, and strictly speaking had neither bourgeoisie nor proletariat? To understand the course of affairs we must try to understand the Russian soul—non-European, with a tension between barbarism and holiness; we must understand even the Russian landscape and its influence. Then the part played by Tsardom, by the Church, above all by the intelligentsia, must be estimated. Then for the failure and horrors that occurred we must remember that the new order was introduced by youth, by criminals, and by visionaries, none of whom had experience in managing anything, and set about managing sixty million people. As to the future of Russia the author is moderately hopeful.

There is no end to books that re-tell Bible stories for children. When they are good they are very welcome and may be very useful, especially when they stick to the facts and do not embroider them unnecessarily or (still worse) invent unnecessarily. *Courageous Adventures, Old Testament Stories for Boys and Girls*, by Laura Hulda Wild, Professor of Biblical Literature, South Hadley, Mass (Abingdon Press; \$1.00), is the product of a modernist, and the stories are told from that standpoint. They are told in a plain, straightforward way, without much distinction. The feature of the book is its humanistic interpretation of what may be supposed to have happened.

Professor R. M. Dawkins, M.A., F.B.A., had several opportunities of sojourning on Mount Athos; he made the very most of his time on the sacred peninsula, and has given us a remarkable book in consequence—*The Monks of Athos* (Allen & Unwin; 15s. net). It is a handsome volume well illustrated and provided with a map. It is neither a history nor a guide-book, but combines the utilities of both in charming style. We have in consequence the best book that has appeared in our language on the many monasteries and quasi-monasteries and hermitages of that region, on which no female may set foot. The life of the brethren is clearly described, and one gets an unforgettable impression of the strange mixture of qualities which it exhibits, fitted to bring now a smile and now almost a tear.

To say the least, the tenth series of 'Problems of Peace' is as good as any of its predecessors; and that is saying a good deal. It is entitled *Anarchy or World Order* (Allen & Unwin; 7s. 6d. net) and consists of thirteen chapters based on lectures delivered to the Geneva Institute of International Affairs by such well-known publicists as F. P. Walters, R. B. Mowat, W. Arnold Foster, J. B. Whitton, C. K. Streit, C. A. W. Manning, and others of the like calibre. The subjects are such as International Anarchy, American Neutrality, The Elements of World Order, The Future of the Collective System. It is all very convincing and reasonable, but the present pitiful international situation is apt to make some of it sound academic and unreal.

A few recent papers by Professor Max Planck have been translated by Mr. W. H. Johnston and published under the title of *The Philosophy of Physics* (Allen & Unwin; 4s. 6d. net). The title may rouse expectations which so small a book is hardly able to fulfil. Of course everything that Planck writes is characterized not only by scientific accuracy but by ripe wisdom and a finely balanced judgment. To those, however, who are at all familiar with his previous work this little book will bring nothing new, while to those who are not already familiar with the ground it covers it will perhaps be somewhat obscure in its brevity. It deals mainly with the problem of causality as affected by the emphasis now being laid on the indeterminacy of the atom. Planck, as is well known, takes sides against the Indeterminists, and argues in favour of strict causality when properly stated. At the same time, unlike Einstein, he firmly upholds moral freedom. 'In my opinion there is not the slightest contradiction between the domination of a strict causality in the sense here adopted and the freedom of human will.' The arguments by which he maintains this position are penetrating and impressive. Two or three closing pages on Science and Faith leave the reader with a feeling of regret that Planck did not write much more on this great topic.

An interesting little essay in psychology is published under the somewhat unattractive title of *Selves and Their Good*, by Helen Wodehouse (Allen & Unwin; 3s. 6d. net). The general position taken is that the self is not an enclosed or isolated unit whose needs are in sharp opposition to the non-self, but the two are in close contact along a boundary not easily to be defined. Problems discussed are

the meaning of a man's own good, the relation of self-realization and self-transcendence, and the possibility of conflict between self and the common good. These topics are discussed with competence and care, but much too briefly to be of any great value.

In the re-issue of the famous 'Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges,' *The Gospel according to St. Luke* is done by the Rev. H. K. Luce, B.D., Headmaster of Durham School (Cambridge University Press; 6s. net). The Introduction includes essays on 'The Study of the Gospels' and on the authorship, date, and sources. In the former a brief but exceedingly clear and intelligent account is given of 'Form-criticism,' which will be useful to beginners. In the appendices there is a thorough treatment of the Messianic consciousness of Jesus as well as an account of contemporary Judaism. The commentary is full and scholarly. There is, in short, a complete apparatus furnished to the student for the understanding of the text and the background, and the reputation which this series has long enjoyed will be deservedly sustained by the present volume.

In these days when not merely Christian doctrines but the Christian standard of morality is assailed on a wide front, it is well that the Decalogue should be studied afresh and its precepts interpreted in their application to the modern world. *Do the Ten Commandments Stand To-day?*, by Mr. J. Parton Milum, B.Sc., Ph.D. (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), is an excellent treatment of this subject. A chapter is given to each of the Ten Commandments under such titles as Modern Idolatry, Leisure and Worship, The Revolt of Youth, The Marriage Vow. The exposition is simple but quite admirable. At the outset some interesting information is given about laws and law-givers of the Mosaic Age, as revealed by recent archaeology, and an epilogue is added dealing with the question of How Does God Speak?

The Measure of a Christian, by the Rev. Arthur Simmons, B.A. (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), is a study of the Beatitudes in which the writer seeks to show what they mean in terms of the life of to-day. The chapters originally appeared in 'Groups' as a series of monthly articles, but reference to the Group Movement is not obtruded, and nothing will be found in these pages to which even the keenest critic of the Groups could take exception. The treatment is clear and simple, the teaching

very wholesome and Christian, while the pages are lit up with a profusion of apt quotations.

We would direct attention to a volume of sermons published by the Epworth Press (3s. 6d. net). The title of the volume is *The Terrible Meek*, and the author the Rev. Charles Kellett, who is already known by his earlier work, 'The Transfigured Commonplace.' These are a few of his subjects: 'The Christian Art of Forgetting,' 'The Real Self,' 'Apocalyptic Life,' 'Simplicity of Life,' and 'Love Banishes Fear.' We have given the last in an abridged form in 'The Christian Year.' It will be seen from this sample that this is a volume which the preacher would do well to procure.

We have received a copy of 'Inter-Varsity Papers,' No. 3, being a publication of the Inter-Varsity Fellowship of Evangelical Unions, Chalmers House, London. It is entitled *Inspiration and Authority* (3d.), and is from the pen of the Rev. T. C. Hammond, M.A., Trinity College, Dublin. It is a thoughtful study in the character of inspiration and the problems of authority. The author is convinced that much of the objection to verbal inspiration arises from a wrong employment of words.

Vita Christi, by Mother St. Paul (Longmans; 5s. net), contains a series of about thirty simple Bible readings dealing with incidents in the closing days of our Lord's earthly life. It is the last of five volumes of similar meditations issued under the same title and covering the whole of Christ's public ministry. The book is full of wholesome Christian teaching and its spirit is warmly devotional. At the close an index to the five volumes is added, together with a list of the meditations arranged in the order of the Christian year.

In 1918 L. V. Hodgkin wrote a charming 'Book of Quaker Saints.' We are not surprised that there have been requests for a cheaper edition. And so now the first half of the earlier volume has been reprinted in the 'New Eversley Series' with the title *A Little Book of Quaker Saints* (Macmillan; 3s. 6d. net). It is no common gift to be able to make the stories of these earlier Friends living, but she has done this, and indeed has had to omit the actual sufferings of children, because a young critic could not bear to read of them, and said, 'It does not matter so much what happens to grown-up people, because I can always skip that bit; but if anything

bad is going to happen to children, you had better leave it out of your book altogether.'

In *Robert Grossetête, the Defender of our Church and Liberties* (S.P.C.K.; 5s. net), Mr. B. C. Boulter has given a scholarly and most readable account of the life, ideals, and work of one of the most interesting of English Churchmen. Grossetête was a devout son of the Church and at the same time a typical and patriotic Englishman. He aimed at Reform, not revolution; he strove to secure ordered liberty; he disliked dictatorship whether in king or pope; intelligent study of the Bible was to him fundamental, and he laboured to place in his parishes clerics who should be both learned and truly pious.

The story of the peasant's son who rose to lead Parliament and be Chancellor of Oxford is well told; and we congratulate the author on an excellent handling of an excellent subject.

A Magic Casement, by Mr. Frederick H. Haines, F.C.I.B. (Pure Thought Press; 6s. net), has for its sub-title 'The Book of Love,' and this sub-title is descriptive of it in so far as it can be described. The theme is love, human and divine, with a considerable amount of attention given to sex and family life. The aim of the writer is to purify thought on these subjects and to emphasize love as spiritual. He writes with an impetuous rush of feeling, but his thought is somewhat vague and formless throughout. While flinging out jibes at dogma he is himself exceedingly dogmatic, and unless the reader is prepared to surrender his judgment and let himself be carried along with a flood of rhetoric, he is not likely to find the book convincing.

Churches, Sects, and Religious Parties, by the Rev. G. W. Butterworth, Litt.D. (S.P.C.K.; 3s. net), is a popular little book containing a deal of useful information about various branches of the Christian Church and semi-Christian parties, but it cannot be ranked high for historic accuracy and balance of judgment. It is written from the standpoint of the Church of England. That Church is placed in the centre, and all others deviate from it by way either of excess or defect. A curiously illogical division is made between the Historic Churches (which include, besides the English, Roman, and Greek Churches, Protestantism, Evangelicalism, and Modernism) and the Free Churches such as Presbyterian, Congrega-

tional, and Baptist, as if these had no history. The tone throughout is kindly but at the same time, no doubt unconsciously, patronizing, and the happy state of things portrayed in the Church of England must be judged to be the product of fond fancy.

Probably it is hopeless to try to correct the hoary old slander that Servetus was 'burnt at Calvin's instigation.' As a matter of fact, Calvin was not a member of the Court which condemned Servetus, and he used every effort to have the sentence altered, but being at that time out of favour with the authorities in Geneva he met with no success.

It is not often that a writer describes his book as 'comments and quotations,' but that is how the Rev. Huw Edwards, M.A., describes in the sub-title his book *Jesus Christ the Word of God* (Stockwell ; 7s. 6d. net). It deals with such great themes as the Pre-existence of Christ, the Incarnation, the Personality of Jesus, the Atonement, Resurrection, and Exaltation. For the exposition of these the

writer has diligently collected statements of leading theologians and religious writers, both ancient and modern, and has very skilfully dovetailed them together. The book accordingly is little more than a catena of quotations, but it may serve a very useful purpose, for the quotations are carefully chosen and the whole exposition proceeds very closely on Biblical lines. An index of the authors quoted would have been a welcome addition.

Dom Bernard Clements, O.S.B., has issued in book form the talks which he gave in 1935 over the air on Prayer—*When Ye Pray* (S.C.M. ; 2s. 6d. net). They are very simple and practical. Directions are given for the cultivation of the habits and spirit of prayer, and the commonest difficulties are discussed, at least all the difficulties that arise from experience, like unanswered prayers, wandering thoughts, and 'dryness' of soul. The author is direct and unconventional, and takes nothing for granted. These talks must have helped many when they were heard, and the impression will be deepened by their literary form.

The Second Commandment.

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL H. WHEELER ROBINSON, M.A., D.D., REGENT'S PARK COLLEGE, OXFORD.

FOR most of us the second commandment has passed into a metaphor, such as that of Cowper's hymn :

The dearest idol I have known,
Whate'er that idol be ;
Help me to tear it from thy throne,
And worship only thee.

This means that the commandment ceases to have much, if any, direct or practical bearing on life. But a deeper realization of the meaning of the commandment will show us that the principle involved does clearly affect religion of every type as much to-day as ever. The principle is that of mediation. The quality of a religion and its chief characteristics are usually decided by the quality of its media. The conception of God and the conception of man held at any one time and in any one area are often common to a number of different types of religion. But the links between God and man, the ways in which contact is established, in which man approaches God, and God approaches

man, may be very different. It is these which give the characteristic colour to any particular type of religion ; that is why sacramental theory is so often the battleground of opposing types.

(1) The second commandment forbids the making of a carved image in the form of any creature as an object of worship. The principle underlying this command may be seen in Dt 4¹⁵⁻¹⁹, where it is said that Israel saw no manner of form on the day that God spoke out of the midst of the fire in Horeb. Any form, that is, would be unworthy of the God of Israel, the God who is known by what He does, and who is defined in the introduction to the Decalogue as the God who brought Israel out of Egypt. This statement of the principle, and indeed this commandment itself in all probability, go back to the work of the eighth-century prophets, notably Hosea and Isaiah. Their opposition to idols is no mere incident of their attack on religious abuses. The great prophets of Israel had come to find the supreme revelation of God in their own consciousness and in

the interpretation of history by its moral standards. Here was the true representation of Yahweh which made any resort to the material emblem an impertinence as well as a corrupting influence. It had not always been so. We know little of the religion of Israel in its nomadic period, but there is no evidence that the use of images as representative of Yahweh belonged to that period (this is the most serious argument against the Mosaic authorship of the commandment).

The large amount of idolatry which is traceable in Israel after its settlement in Canaan was in all probability developed under Canaanite influence. In this period there can be no doubt that Yahweh was represented at the local sanctuaries by the form of a small bull (1 K 12^{28ff.}). We get an instructive glimpse of the part taken by idols in private worship through the well-known story of Micah (Jg 17). Against all such practices prophets and psalmists imply with scorn that the maker of an idol is himself more than the idol (Is 44^{9ff.}, Ps 115^{4ff.}). In the exilic and post-exilic periods, the very associations of idolatry would have been enough to condemn it; as Moore says: 'Idolatry was the universal concomitant of polytheism, and the Jews made no difference between them' (*Judaism*, i. 362). But there is more than this in the condemnation uttered by prophets and psalmists; there is implicitly the positive principle from which the higher prophecy springs, namely, that God must be known and worshipped through the highest capacities of man, spiritual rather than physical.

(2) The significance of this attitude as a preparation for the Christian doctrine of the Incarnation should not be overlooked. The true argument from prophecy is indeed to be found along such lines of spiritual continuity rather than through the casual coincidence of a phrase or an incident. If the consciousness of a Jeremiah can be made the adequate vehicle of the revelation of God, and if Jeremiah himself can turn from the visible temple to the invisible God whom he has come to know in the travail of his own soul, then we already have the Biblical principle by which to approach the Incarnation. Jesus was in the eyes of His disciples a prophet mighty in word and deed before they were constrained to recognize in Him the Messiah. So also in later days, whatever elaborations of Christology were formed, theologians had always to work on the data of the prophetic consciousness as they were exemplified in Jesus. His disciples have repeatedly been led to use the highest categories they knew in trying to explain His unique personality.

But in every recognition of His divine nature, their knowledge of Him must be based on a human nature so surrendered to the will of the Father as to present itself not only as the highest point of our humanity, but also as God manifest in the flesh.

The divine is known in and through its image, though this image is not in the physical, but in the spiritual characteristics of Jesus. This is in full accord with the cardinal distinction between man and God drawn by Isaiah: 'the Egyptians are men, and not God; and their horses flesh, and not spirit' (31²), a distinction between flesh (*basar*) and spirit (*ruach*), which, as Duhm rightly discerned, forms the *motif* of the subsequent religious development to 1 Co 15. This distinction is not an unbridged dualism, for the Spirit of God can work and does work in the hearts of men, and thus the Spirit makes the flesh its sacramental unfolding, if its partial disguise. So also the manner of the deeper and fuller revelation of God in Jesus Christ itself provides a moral challenge and test (since the response to the spiritual must be itself spiritual), and also offers a significant example of the trust placed by the Father of spirits in the human spirits whom He has created. Here Canon Lilley's words may usefully be quoted: 'That God should tabernacle with men without ever declaring Himself openly, that He should to the last as it were jealously preserve His incognito, and yet trust men to recognize Him for what He really was, is surely an instance of belief in the spiritual capacity of man such as man himself would always shrink from claiming.'¹

St. Paul uses the same word (*εἰκόν*) of man as being made in the likeness of God (1 Co 11⁷ 15⁴⁹, Col 3¹⁰), in accordance with Gn 1²⁷ (LXX), as he does of Christ, the image of God (2 Co 4⁴), the manifestation of the unseen God (Col 1¹⁵), into the image of whose glorified being the believer is eventually to be transformed (Ro 8²⁹, 2 Co 3¹⁸).

(3) This is one great, indeed the greatest, application of the positive principle involved in the prophetic consciousness of which the negative is the second commandment. But it is evident that the principle applies not only to the Incarnation, but to every means of worship. At some periods of Christian thought it has been urged that the Incarnation justifies the use of images, or that the use of images is a visible confirmation of the truth of the Incarnation. Here of course we must distinguish between the image and the idol, whatever be our personal or ecclesiastical attitude to the use of images at all. One outcome of the icono-

¹ *Religion and Revelation*, 110.

clastic controversy was the distinction made at the Second Council of Nicæa (787), a distinction confirmed in 1563 at the twenty-fifth session of the Council of Trent, between a legitimate veneration of images and an idolatrous worship of them. This distinction should be kept in mind more carefully by Protestants. These may feel that there is danger in the use of all material emblems, but this is quite a different thing from identifying images with idols. The idol may be regarded as an extension of the fetish when power is ascribed to it, or when, as in primitive times, it is regarded as part of the very nature of the superhuman power with which it is connected, as a man's shadow was then felt to be a part of himself. But our attitude to the use of *images* is a matter of expediency rather than of principle, since we can none of us dispense with some kind of representation of the God we worship even though it be but the mental image. Bunyan's experience, in his 'dark night of the soul', is the more suggestive because of its *naïveté*. He tells us (*Grace Abounding*, § 108), 'when . . . I have laboured to compose my mind, and fix it upon God; then with great force hath the tempter laboured to distract and confound me, and to turn away my mind, by presenting to my heart and fancy the form of a bush, a bull, a besom, or the like, as if I should pray to these.' The passage is instructive, because it helps us to see the genesis of the concrete image in the mind of the primitive worshipper. In Bunyan, of course, it simply illustrates a morbid twist of that imagination to which we owe his masterpiece.

Religion cannot dispense with 'imagination', and there is no difference of *principle* in the vivid imagination of God as the Ancient of days, or of Jesus Christ amongst the golden candlesticks, and the statue or picture which embodies such imagination, without being identified with deity. As a matter of fact, the Orthodox Church differs from the usage of the Catholic by employing pictures and rejecting solid statues, whilst the Protestant nowadays often accepts a cross where he would repudiate a crucifix. In this present tendency of Protestantism the impartial judge may discern the consciousness that the more sensuous imagery of catholicizing types of religion has a power over the ordinary man which the more puritan type of worship does not possess. Again, it is a question of expediency rather than principle, even if common practice draws more or less definite limits. Many reverent Protestants would sympathize with Sir Thomas Browne's words: 'At the sight of a Crosse or Crucifix I can dispence with my hat, but scarce with the thought or memory of my Saviour. . . . I could

never heare the *Ave Marie* Bell without an elevation . . . whilst therefore they directed their devotions to her, I offered mine to God.' This may remind us of an incident in the life of Stephen Grellet, the Quaker. When he was visiting an Italian convent, he passed some girls who were kneeling before an image of the Madonna, but showed no signs of reverence as they talked and laughed to one another. When he was given an opportunity of speaking to them a little later, he took occasion to rebuke them for their irreverence, though he abhorred their images.

(4) It need hardly be said that the second commandment raises the great question of the relation of art to religion and of the place of æsthetic values in the Kingdom of God. Perhaps the only art which was really native to Israel and achieved a unique success was that of the religious lyric as we see it in the Psalms, itself largely influenced by the prophetic use of poetry. It might be debated whether the prophetic attitude to image-making fettered or destroyed the artistic capacities of the Jew, or whether, on the other hand, the rooted religious passion of the Hebrew which flowered into prophecy was itself alien from artistic achievement. But we certainly must not show any sympathy with Renan's famous sneer at St. Paul at Athens when 'his spirit was provoked within him as he beheld the city full of idols.' Renan apostrophizes the sculptures of Athens—'True gods and true goddesses'—with the remark, 'the mistake of this ugly little Jew will be your death-warrant.' The question here, of course, is whether St. Paul's attitude to images of gods and goddesses was such a mistake after all. At least we may say in justice to the puritan spirit that it surrenders something good in itself in order to achieve a greater good. The law of achievement is concentration; the Bible would not be the supreme book of religion if it had not concentrated on the moral approach to the spiritual even at the cost of the æsthetic. Every religious community must ask itself to-day, how far that attitude ought to be, or can be, maintained. But the question cannot be properly answered unless we go back to first principles and see clearly why the prophets and the prophetic legislators abjured the tangible and visible image in the worship of God. It may be urged with some truth that the danger then was of association with heathenism, a danger which in its ancient form no longer exists. It may also be urged, and again with truth, that there is a very real approach to the true by way of the beautiful as well as by way of the good, and that our worship of the God of Truth ought to include both. But worship

is not necessarily deprived of beauty because a self-denying ordinance is passed against the use of images. The beauty of a great literature is already there in the Bible, and still gleams through the muddy vesture of the usual manner in which it is publicly read. Architecture may express the sublimities of religion, without constraining and confining them. Music is so ethereal in its structure that it runs no risk, at any rate when it is music, of overlaying the heavenly with the earthly. Intelligent devotion will recognize that all these things are but symbols of something too great for their expression, and religious sympathy will leave room for many types of worship to make their appeal to the many types of worshippers. The ground of decision will be practical rather than theoretical, and may vary for different individuals and in different circumstances. The one essential Christian rule is, 'Seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness,' whatever may be added thereto.

(5) Finally, the second commandment bears on that most subtle and elusive of all forms of mediation—the use of words and particularly of metaphor. This has been partly indicated by Bacon in his famous classification of the four great classes of 'Idols', namely, those of the Tribe, of the Cave, of the Market-place, and of the Theatre. It is the third class which here concerns us—those of the Market-place, *i.e.* those that spring from the use of words in human intercourse: 'men believe,' he says, 'that their reason governs words; but it is also true that words react on the understanding' (*Novum Organum*, lix), and he gives, as one kind of idol so imposed, the 'Prime Mover' of his *bête noire*, Aristotle. We may take the phrase as a type of the metaphor which has had so great a history in theology. Perhaps there is no line of doctrine

which has not suffered in this way, by the erection of a system upon a name, without regard to the fact that in such high matters the human name can express, and only imperfectly express at most, but one aspect of the whole reality, even if it corresponds to some reality. Think, for example, of the doctrine of the Atonement, the most notorious instance, and how the figures of ransom, sacrifice, penalty, satisfaction, and all the rest have been expanded into systems of soteriology. The metaphor can in this way easily become an idol which tyrannizes over the understanding and narrows the whole outlook. Even in that highest of all examples, the doctrine of the Holy Trinity, the names Father and Son and Holy Spirit have been used in forgetfulness that they are only human metaphors, however great and essential they may be for religion. Fatherhood and Sonship have become only too often the basis of a binitarian theology, with the Third Person reduced to a mere relation between them. The metaphor of fatherhood has the highest consecration in *religion*, but the theologian does well to remember that even this is a metaphor drawn from human relations, and not a metaphysical basis for speculation.

These last examples will serve to remind us how difficult it is to obey the second commandment. In a different way, it was difficult, very difficult for the ancient world, which stood amazed before the spectacle of an imageless religion, the hard-won trophy of prophetic witness and martyrdom. But for us, as for the Jew, obedience to the commandment is the essential condition of a truly spiritual religion. It is a command to us Christians to endure as seeing the invisible, and to worship Him who is Spirit in spirit and in truth, whatever be the media of our worship.

Religion and History.¹

BY THE REVEREND PROFESSOR CHRISTOPHER R. NORTH, M.A., HANDSWORTH COLLEGE, BIRMINGHAM.

It is significant that the only religions which conceive of any meaning, not to speak of a redemptive purpose and activity of God, in history, are those which originated in a Semitic environment, namely,

¹ Part of an address given before the Oriental Society of the University College, Cardiff, on February 10th, 1936.

Judaism, Christianity, and Islam. It is significant, too, that these are the only genuinely monotheistic religions. Of them, the conception of a religious philosophy of history is less prominent in Islam than it is in Judaism and Christianity. In so far as Islam has such a philosophy it is due to its Jewish-Christian antecedents, rather than essential

to its very nature as a religion. Muhammad, of course, is an historical figure. He is also—so Muslims believe—the last of a long succession of prophets sent by Allah. But the Allah of the Quran, if one may say so reverently, talks much and does very little. He lays many commandments upon men, and is quick to punish them if they disobey Him. But He does not do anything to redeem them; still less does He suffer to redeem them.

Since, then, Islam makes no original contribution to a religious philosophy of history, we may confine our attention to Judaism and Christianity. To begin with the Old Testament: a religious interpretation of history is not merely incidental to the Old Testament; it is fundamental to the historical and prophetic books, and is prominent also in some of the Psalms. History, indeed, in Hebrew religion, is not the least important of the media through which God reveals Himself. Moreover, the Old Testament sets forth a tolerably complete and self-contained philosophy of history—God's choice of Israel from among all the nations; His acts of redeeming grace on behalf of His people at the Red Sea and at many subsequent crises in their national life; His use of foreign nations as His instruments, whether for the chastisement of His people, or for their salvation; His appointment of Israel to be a light to the Gentiles, that His salvation may be to the ends of the earth. Such, broadly, is the conception, no matter whether we think of the Servant of Yahweh as an individual, or the nation as a whole. At the same time, the Old Testament is, even in this matter, incomplete without the New. The doctrine of the Servant-Nation is to a great extent obscured in its final pages, and the Kingdom of God and the Messiah, so eagerly anticipated in post-exilic Judaism, are obviously not yet, but are still to come.

When we turn to the New Testament it is plain that its writers, without exception, conceive themselves to have witnessed the fulfilment of the promises contained in the Old. The Messiah has come, and with Him the Kingdom. More than that, God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself. The Word which was from all eternity with God has become flesh and dwelt among men. The gospel is no projection of human wishes into the void of abstract ideas. Christ is no myth, nor was it a phantom that was crucified. 'That which was from the beginning, that which we have heard, that which we have seen with our eyes, that which we beheld, and our hands handled, concerning the Word of life (and the life was manifested, and we

have seen, and bear witness, and declare unto you the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and was manifested unto us); that which we have seen and heard declare we unto you also' (1 Jn 1¹⁻³). There were many redemptive religions, of a sort, competing for men's allegiance in the early Christian centuries, and it seems certain that Christianity had an overwhelming advantage over the mystery religions precisely because it could point to a Redeemer who was an historical figure, crucified under Pontius Pilate, as the creeds were at pains to emphasize, and not some mythical hero or sun-god whose exploits, if he had ever performed any, could not be verified, much less exactly dated. Christianity has laid tremendous stress upon history. It is, for good or ill, indissolubly joined with history.

There are those who feel that this association of religion with history is unfortunate. The objection may take two forms. One of them is essentially modern, dating only from the rise of historical criticism. Briefly it is that it is highly precarious to make the truth of religion depend upon alleged historical events that took place two thousand and more years ago, and of which we cannot at this distance of time be sure that they happened. Would it not therefore be better to dissociate the truth of religion from such a doubtful ally as history? In the second place—and this objection in its various forms is very ancient—is not the association of religion with history unfortunate on idealistic grounds? Is there not something of the earth, earthy, about the conception of the Word made flesh? How can the Infinite be revealed in the finite, or the Eternal in time? Or, if it could be, must it not suffer some diminution of its brightness in the process? No doubt some pictorial presentation of reality is desirable, perhaps even necessary, for the multitude; but the great soul will pierce beyond the veil of material things to the inner shrine of reality. This second objection receives from time to time recruits from those whose faith has suffered loss from the assaults of criticism, and who thereby hope to turn their historical scepticism to glorious gain.

The first of these two objections leads us to ask certain questions. Is the truth of Christianity bound up with that of the Biblical philosophy of history? Is the truth of the Biblical interpretation of history confirmed by criticism? Or, if it is not, does the Bible contain historical materials adequate to the construction of a new philosophy which can bear the weight of Christian doctrine? What is the relation of the facts, so far as we can

ascertain them, to the traditional and Catholic—I use the term Catholic in its widest meaning—interpretation of the facts?

Now I think we must take it as proven that much in the Old Testament that our forefathers accepted as historical can no longer be accepted as such in the literal sense of the word. On the other hand, there is remarkably little mythology, as distinct from legend, in the Old Testament. Even the first eleven chapters of Genesis, though they may have a mythological background, are not pure mythology, even if they are not history. They are suffused with moral purpose and meaning. For the rest, such fragments as we have of the old Dragon-myth were in time assimilated to the undoubted historical event of the Exodus from Egypt (cf. Ps 74^{12ff.}, Is 51^{9f.}). Broadly, the difference between the old interpretation of Israel's history, and the facts as we are able to disentangle them, lies in this: the Law in its fulness was supposed to have been delivered to Moses at Sinai; we regard it as the accumulated result of centuries of development. The period of the Judges, on the older view, was one of declension and apostasy. We, while we recognize that there was in some sort a falling away from the simple and austere faith of the desert, think of the settlement and the years that followed as a period of growth and adolescence. Further, the centre of gravity has shifted from the Law to the Prophets. This, however, is not only great gain for its own sake; it brings out more clearly that unity of thought and purpose which runs through both Testaments, a unity which was liable to be obscured in the old days when a sharp contrast was drawn between Law and Gospel. The place accorded to the prophets in modern study is the more remarkable in that the extent of Messianic prophecy would seem to be much less than was formerly supposed. Despite the almost occasional character of Messianic prophecy, the prophets are seen to be men of gigantic moral stature and unique religious insight. Archæology has brought to light nothing that can explain them. Outside the Old Testament the figure most like to the prophets is Zoroaster. But Zoroastrianism differed markedly from Judaism in that Zoroaster had no successor, with the consequence that after his death the religion became to a large extent engulfed in the backwash of the polytheism which he had laboured to destroy. In the Old Testament there was a long succession of prophets—many more, as criticism assures us, than the fifteen who have given their names to books—and the seeming catastrophe of the Exile made it possible for

Judaism to start afresh with the entail of age-long Baal-worship cut off. These facts are surely not without significance, and if anywhere in history we can trace the workings of an overruling divine providence, it is surely here. It is not, as Renan asserted, that the Semitic Hebrews had a genius for monotheism. The rise of monotheism among the Hebrews is due rather to a unique combination of geographical and historical conditions, the clash of contending world-empires on the narrow land-bridge that lay on the highway between the two great centres of early civilization, Babylon and Egypt. The monotheism of the prophets was no outcome of abstract thinking. It was forged in the glowing fires of a definite historical situation.

Turning now to the New Testament, we cannot imagine Christ coming to any other people than the Jews. Nowhere else were conditions requisite to His coming. Nowhere but in Palestine could He have been what He was, or have been in the least intelligible. India gave birth to the Buddha; it could not have given birth to the Christ. There is, then, an essential unity between the Old and New Testaments, and neither is properly intelligible without the other. The thing that is central to the Gospels, and without which the rest of the New Testament could never have been written, is the consciousness of Jesus that He was in a unique and absolute sense the Son of God. 'All things have been delivered unto me of my Father: and no one knoweth the Son, save the Father; neither doth any know the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son willeth to reveal him.' These words are common to Matthew and Luke. They go back to Q. Their genuineness is further attested by their consistency with everything else that Jesus said and did. Nothing is more certain than that Jesus uttered them. There is spontaneity and a complete lack of argumentative self-consciousness about them. Some disciples had just returned from a successful mission, and they are part of an unpremeditated outburst of thanksgiving to His Father. It is as though Jesus had never intended to say them, for, despite the impression left by certain passages in the Fourth Gospel, it seems certain that He did not go about trying to prove that He was the Son of God. But He could not have said them at all if the unique relationship to God which they disclose had not been His abiding consciousness. We may have doubts about the Virgin Birth, we may even have doubts about the Resurrection; but when once these words had been uttered the Nicene Creed was inevitable.

As I see it, there is no essential difference between the philosophy of history of that Bible whose contents are in the order that tradition has handed down to us, and the Bible with its contents redistributed and redated by criticism. We may feel that in the Jewish canon the impress of Deuteronomic and Priestly writers was deeper than it ought to have been. But while we are inclined to give to them less prominence in the creative development of Hebrew monotheism, we put in their place the prophets, whose conviction of the divine activity and purpose in history was at least as strong as theirs. It was, indeed, from the prophets that the Deuteronomic writers derived their philosophy of history. It seems to me that there is sufficient indubitably historical material in the Bible to bear the weight of the main superstructure of Christian doctrine. 'Form-criticism' notwithstanding, I can see no reason for an historical scepticism that should lead us to take refuge in a Barthian doctrine of transcendence, which is, at long last, essentially agnostic. Dr. Clement Webb has recently argued (*The Historical Element in Religion*, 86, 89) that the participation of an individual 'in a life which owes its character, or in a sentiment which owes its intensity to a tradition about the past of a society whose life he shares, gives him a legitimate ground for the conviction that this past was at least so far what tradition affirms it to have been, as to have been able to inspire the sentiment and to form the character, the reality of which he knows, as it were, from the inside. . . . While such a tradition is certainly not a sufficient guarantee of the actual past occurrence of even conspicuous details, it is yet a witness to the historicity of the general situation presupposed in the present consciousness of the community.'

There is, of course, a large measure of truth in this, and it is obvious that the average Christian who has no historical training cannot examine the historical foundations of the faith for himself, but must take his history on trust from the testimony of the Christian community of which he is a member. But there must be those who are competent to examine the evidences at their source, and it is no wonder that some who heard Dr. Webb's lectures were desirous to know how he would be disposed to apply his interpretation of the religious element in history to some of those questions, which have been so warmly debated among Christians in recent times (p. 95); in other words, whether he was prepared on purely historical grounds to defend such doctrines as the Virgin Birth, the Resurrection, and the institution of the Eucharist. Christi-

anity differs from such a religion as Buddhism in that, if the Church makes any serious departure from its original standards, it can be brought back to the test of the New Testament. It is no use crying out against Protestantism. We ought rather to be thankful that Protestantism, when it becomes necessary, is possible. Buddhism to-day is such that Gautama, if he were to come back to earth, probably would not know it. And a Buddhist Protestantism is not possible, for the reason that it is by no means clear what the original Buddhism was. We do know something of what primitive Christianity was, and while it would be foolish to declaim against developments in the Christian Church, it is just as foolish to fly from historical scepticism to any form of High-Church doctrine as it is to fly to Barthian transcendence. Christian origins will bear looking into. Or, if they will not, the Church, without proper anchorage, must sooner or later suffer shipwreck.

I turn now briefly to examine the second objection, that the association of religion with history is unfortunate on idealistic grounds, and results in religion being bound to earth instead of mounting up into the heavenly places. Such thoughts are never far from mysticism in all its forms, and if Christian mysticism has not gone to the lengths of Sufism and the Upanishad philosophy it is because Christianity has never been able to cut itself adrift from the anchorage of the New Testament. And what would it profit if it did? We have already remarked that the only genuinely monotheistic religions are those which conceive of a divine purpose in history. Pure mysticism is very closely related to theosophy and all manner of unverifiable metaphysical speculation. It can hardly avoid falling into the abyss of pantheism, and it purchases its freedom from material things by a failure to appreciate moral distinctions. It tends to despise the body, and can only with difficulty steer clear of an unhealthy asceticism on the one hand, and an immoral licence on the other. At the best, it would seem that we are worse, rather than better off, when on æsthetic and philosophical grounds we become suspicious of the association of religion with history. Religion tends to become a quest for truth, a body of doctrine—we may even say of speculation—*about* God, rather than an announcement and acceptance of the gospel of His grace in Christ. 'The Word became flesh, and dwelt among us' becomes a principle enunciating the truth of divine immanence, rather than what it was in its original context, a statement of the incarnation of God in Christ. No doubt God is immanent, nor is

it wrong for us preachers to make moral generalizations on the basis of historical incidents. But history is history before it is allegory.

I do not wish to disparage mysticism. There is a mystical element in all true religious experience. We ought so to discipline our souls that we may have mystical communion with God. But we must start from the faith once delivered. What God has revealed Himself to be in Christ, each of us may now apprehend for himself. But without the historic Christ we shall hardly get any farther than ourselves. We are all alive to the perils of pure individualism in religion. The history of religion would seem further to teach that the

experience of even a considerable group may be very far from the truth unless in the first instance it was occasioned by some historical event or series of events the truth of which is still open to examination and verification. For my part, I must confess that my faith would suffer, not, indeed, eclipse, but at least serious loss, if I could only say that I believed in the 'Christ-Idea,' but not in the fact of Christ. The mystic way would still be open to me; but the history of religion appears to teach that the only mystic way that leads anywhere but into vacancy is that which He who is the Way, the Truth, and the Life has opened up before us.

In the Study.

Virginitus Puerisque.

Clyde-built.

BY THE REVEREND C. M. HEPBURN, B.D., MOULIN,
FITLOCHRY.

'Except the Lord build . . . they labour in vain that build.'—Ps 127¹.

DURING the merry month of May two events of interest, not I imagine unconnected, are due to take place. On May 26th our gracious Queen Mary will have her birthday. On May 27th another great lady, for 'the liner she's a lady,' as I daresay you know Rudyard Kipling said, will set out upon her maiden Atlantic voyage from Southampton to New York. Of both our Queen Maries we are very proud. But the Clydeside people who built the great ship have of course a particular pride in her. Some time ago, when she came steaming down the Clyde to start her life upon the ocean, among the thousands who lined the banks to give her a cheer as she passed by was a little lad who turned to his mother with glistening eyes as he asked, 'Is that the boat ma faither built?' 'Ay, son, that's the boat yer faither built, an' a graun joab he's made o't.' And the *Queen Mary* is a grand job, one of the grandest any shipbuilders have yet achieved. It is a compliment and a guarantee even to say that she is Clyde-built. In the shipping world it is a word which stands for the finest workmanship possible. Once while crossing the Channel

and walking round the deck of the steamer I noticed a brass plate with the inscription:

S.S. *Canterbury*
built by
DENNY, Dumbarton.

She was Clyde-built. So I felt I was on a sound ship—one with no flaws.

But there is another word to be proud of, British-built. It represents a high standard also, one which has not been easily reached. Any article stamped 'made in Britain,' we pride ourselves, can be bought with confidence by any person. In a sense we ourselves being British-born are British-built. And there's nothing wrong in having a high opinion of our race, and place, and country. I reminds me of a girl who went to London and her mistress said to her quite a long time afterwards 'Annie, you didn't tell me you belonged to Aberdeen?' 'No, Mum,' said Annie, 'I was told never to boast.' She was proud of being an Aberdonian. I hope we can be equally proud of our home place whatever it is. Remember Paul was. He said he was a citizen of 'no mean city.' That was Tarsus. But he also prized his Roman status. You remember that when the centurion said, 'Art thou a Roman?' Paul said, 'Yea.' One day not very long ago a little Italian girl in Rome was run over by a motor-car. She was hurt severely, rushed to hospital, and operated upon at once. I can't say why, but she couldn't be given chloro-

form. She bore the terrible pain with wonderful bravery, and when one of her nurses bent over her with a word of praise she stoutly said, 'I couldn't cry. I'm an Italian.' She was proud of being Italian. Do we think it as splendid to be British—British-built and British-born?

But the best thing of all is being Christ-built. A British character should be good. A Christ-built character is still better. We began with a text: 'Except the Lord build . . . they labour in vain that build.' Our life won't be the noblest it can be, unless we let Christ have a hand in building it. But it can be Christian or Christ-built with His help, and we could have no higher aim than that. A very eminent man of our race, Lord Guthrie by name, never forgot something his father wrote to him in his earlier days: 'Yes, I would like to see you a great advocate: but what is that to being a great Christian?' Christ-built or Christian—isn't that the best thing of all?

No Cross, No Crown.

By THE REVEREND D. T. DAVIES, M.A., B.D., LONDON.

'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life.'—Rev 2¹⁰ (R.V.).

WHEN our late King George v. died, his body was brought on a gun-carriage to Westminster Hall, where it lay in state for some days. As the royal coffin, with the crown laid upon it, was being borne through the hushed streets a curious thing happened. You girls and boys know that the crown of the King has a cross on the top of it, set in precious stones. On this occasion, owing to the slight shaking of the carriage, the cross became loose and toppled off the crown. The officer in charge was quick to notice the mishap. He picked it up at once and kept it until the journey's end. He then set it back in its place. The crown was not complete without the cross.

There are some folk who wish it otherwise; they want the palm of victory without the dust of the running track. In school we do not think highly of the boy who hankers after a prize, but who dodges the days of diligent hard work which is the price of such a reward. On the football field it would be considered 'soft' to take the ball when no one else is about and place it behind the goal-posts. The real fun and thrill of the game come to us in the struggle to beat the defence of the rival team and win through to the goal.

In Regent Street, London, there is a noted building called the Polytechnic Institute, or the 'Poly' for short. Hundreds of young people

have found it a home from home. There are classes to improve the mind, as well as a gymnasium, and many other clubs to keep the body fit. It all grew out of the big heart of one man, Quintin Hogg, who wanted to help young fellows amid the temptations of a great city after business hours. He was asked once how much it cost to build that great fabric. His reply was, 'Just one man's life blood.' The crown of this noble man's life was joined to the cross of his labour of love.

The Apostle Paul in one of his letters goes out of his way to tell those to whom he wrote how he longed to see them again, because they were 'his joy and crown.' This was to the members of the Church in the city of Philippi—the people whom the Apostle, by his preaching, had won over to the side of Jesus Christ. We have only to turn back a few pages, to the Book of the Acts of the Apostles, in order to find at what a great price that 'crown' had been obtained by the Apostle. In that city he had been flogged and flung into prison. But he endured such a cross quite bravely for the joy and crown of being the founder of the first Christian Church in Europe.

Often people had tried to lay hands on Jesus Christ to make Him King. Yet He would not take any such short-cut to the throne. 'He set his face stedfastly to go to Jerusalem,' and there faced up to the ordeal of the Cross if only He might become our Saviour. No cross, no crown; or, as our Lord in the Bible tells us, 'Be thou faithful unto death, and I will give thee the crown of life.'

Two Blessed Geese.

By THE REVEREND SIDNEY H. PRICE,
GREAT SHELFORD, CAMBRIDGE.

'God . . . maketh us wiser than the fowls.'—Job 35¹¹.

What do you like best in the Children's Hour you hear on the wireless? With many people the Zoo Man is quite the favourite. He always has the most interesting stories to tell about animals and birds.

Some visitors to Whipsnade saw a very strange scene not long ago, and wrote to one of the papers about it. In one of the large enclosures where various kinds of birds and animals live, there were two game-cocks which had evidently declared war on each other. I do not know what the quarrel was about, though I imagine one wished to show the other he was master. As soon, however, as they prepared to fight, two small geese dashed up to them with flapping wings and parted them.

They repeated this several times, until the cocks finally separated, and apparently quite forgot their quarrel. I must say, I had never thought of the goose as a peacemaker before. -

The story of these game-cocks reminds me of two boys playing near a railway crossing, when an argument arose as to whether they were in the street or on the road. Very silly of them, wasn't it? One insisted it was a STREET, and the other declared it was a ROAD. They were actually preparing to settle the dispute with their fists when another boy called out, 'The Silver Jubilee train's coming.' The boys stopped their argument, and ran to the gates to see it. They gazed at its long stream-lined body, so different from all ordinary engines, and looked eagerly to see the driver, and by the time the train had passed they were ready to start playing again. So an engine was a peacemaker too that day.

Have you ever been a peacemaker? It is not easy at times to know just what to do when there is some one quarrelsome about. Some years ago, there lived in Ireland a lady who had a number of small boy friends. She was Mrs. C. F. Alexander, the wife of a bishop. These boys told Mrs. Alexander that they could not understand many things they were taught in church and in their Scripture lessons, so she said she would help them by writing verses about some of these things. For instance, to help them understand the story of the death of Jesus, she wrote some verses which you all know:

There is a green hill far away,
Without a city wall,
Where the dear Lord was crucified,
Who died to save us all.

When she wanted to show them what Jesus meant by 'Blessed are the peacemakers,' she wrote:

When deep within our swelling hearts
The thoughts of pride and anger rise,
When bitter words are on our tongues
And tears of passion in our eyes,

Then we may stay the angry blow,
Then we may check the hasty word,
Give gentle answers back again,
And fight a battle for our Lord.

Did you ever think of that? When you are a peacemaker, you are fighting a battle for Jesus Christ. Whenever you control your anger and try to show kindness to those who hurt you, or whenever you help others to settle their quarrel, you

are doing fine service for Him. Remember the geese which stopped the fight between the game-cocks. God has made us wiser than the fowls.

The Christian Year.

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER.

The Life of Service.

'I am among you as he that serveth.'—Lk 22²⁷.

Five-and-twenty centuries ago Aristotle described man as a social being. And one of the fathers of English philosophy said of the life of man apart from society that it was 'solitary, poor, nasty, brutish, and short.' And everyday experience proves the truth of these sayings. And as man rises in the scale of civilization he becomes more, not less, dependent, for all his best good, on co-operation with his fellows and on the life of the community. Can it be that that which is true of the rest of his nature is found untrue when we speak of religion? Surely not! Here, too, man must be a social being, one who accepts and enjoys all the benefits and all the obligations of the divine society and schools himself in the duties of a citizen of the heavenly Jerusalem. As man becomes more civilized, and life becomes more complicated, morality must, it would seem, make more and more claims on the individual.

The Archbishop of York once said that the art of virtuous living consisted of 'behaving as if you were not present.' Exactly! Let us make the glory of God and the service of others our aim, and life becomes rich and happy and successful. We strike here a fact fundamental to human nature. The self-centred man is the unhappy man. There is a very beautiful little anonymous mediæval work called the *Theologia Germanica*, a book of mysticism which Martin Luther kept on the same shelf as his Bible. In it the writer says: 'It is said, it was because Adam ate the apple that he was lost, or fell. I say, it was because of his claiming something for his own, and because of his I, Mine, Me, and the like. Had he eaten seven apples, and yet never claimed anything for his own, he would not have fallen.' How true that is. The deep-seated disease of fallen man is self. And the Fall, whatever it was, whenever and wherever it occurred, can have been nothing else than the assertion of self against the unity of mankind. And to-day the whole world is suffering from the sickness of what Mr. R. H. Tawney calls an *Acquisitive Society*. The whole of our civilization is based on the assumption that a man's life *does* consist in the abundance

of the things which he possesseth, and the plain fact, verified again and again in daily experience, proves that it does not. In a world constituted as ours is man must work to live. It was not hardness on St. Paul's part, but true wisdom and insight which made him say that, 'if any man would not work, neither should he eat.' And one of the worst condemnations of our present social order is that it denies to so many the opportunity to work. So we say, Try to earn and to keep a worthy place in life. But let our daily work be done in the spirit of service.

Virtue does not consist in longing for some future condition of society, where it would be possible to act with ideal rightness, but in taking this world as we find it, and resolutely endeavouring to act as nobly as possible in every situation, striving always to choose the better of two alternatives. Bishop Blougram really puts the position fairly when he says :

The common problem, yours, mine, every one's,
Is—not to fancy what were fair in life
Provided it could be,—but, finding first
What may be, then find how to make it fair
Up to our means : a very different thing !
No abstract intellectual plan of life
Quite irrespective of life's plainest laws,
But one, a man, who is man and nothing more,
May lead within a world which (by your leave)
Is Rome or London, not Fool's-paradise.

There are few if any places where it is better worth while being a Christian than in a man's own place of business.

Cannot a man live a good life without accepting Christianity? Of course he can. Most of us know some man or woman whom we love and admire who is without religious convictions. But if we look carefully we shall find often that such people have been brought up in religious homes and that when the religious beliefs of their younger days left them, the habits, the mental and emotional outlook of those days continued. For the connexion between belief and practice is closer and more intimate than was supposed in those distant pre-War days when men assured us that it did not matter what a man believed as long as his life was good. Our life may be good, but its goodness will surely take a different form according as we regard our fellow-man as 'only an infinitesimal and transitory element in the social organization' or as an immortal being, made in God's image, a brother for whom Christ died, an unlit lamp waiting to be kindled and illuminated by the Holy Spirit.

The Christian religion is not the only one rich in good works. We know how much England owes to the charity and public spirit of believing Jews. In India the Parsees have always been rich in good works. But whatever we may say of other faiths, we can say—for the proofs are before our eyes daily—that the disciples of Him who came 'to seek and to save that which was lost' do, in this matter, follow in the Master's steps.

When George Lansbury first became known as a social worker he was a convinced secularist, a man who repudiated Christianity and all supernatural sanctions. And then gradually the first fire of his social enthusiasm seemed to leave him. And then one day the thought came to him, whether he might not find the driving power he needed if he returned to the faith of his boyhood. For a year he thought, and read, and at last prayed, and at the year's end he was back as a communicant at Poplar Parish Church where he was confirmed as a boy. And since then he has never lost hope or faith or love, but still lives and works for others.

It is as true to-day as when the words were written that 'A man shall be as an hiding-place from the wind, and a covert from the tempest ; as rivers of water in a dry place, as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.'

So a man must not let his life be all getting and spending ; he must find some place in it for free, unstinted giving. And he will find the greatest happiness if what he gives most freely is himself, and if his delights, too, are with the sons of men.¹

Dr. Fosdick, in *The Hope of the World*,² tells the story of an aviator who carried mails from New York to Cleveland, and fell in the mountains of Pennsylvania and was killed. 'They found upon his body a letter addressed "To My Beloved Brother-Pilots and Pals" and marked "To be opened only after my death." Listen to what he said : "I go west, but with a cheerful heart. I hope what small sacrifice I have made may be of use to the cause. When we fly we are fools, they say. . . . But every one in this wonderful aviation service is doing the world far more good than the public can appreciate. We risk our necks, we give our lives, we perfect a service for the benefit of the world at large. . . . But stick to it, boys. I'm still very much with you all. See you all again."

'You pity that boy? I don't. He had more fun in his short life than all the satiated pleasure-seekers who habitually try to feed their souls on superficial foam. For the elemental joy is creative-

¹ Peter Green, *Faith and Service*, 95.

² P. 150.

ness, and when that spirit of creativeness is turned to spiritual ends and helps to transform personalities and societies it is so satisfying that I do not know whether it is selfish or unselfish.'

And so at the end it may be said of us, as it was of J. B. Paton :

For all his soul on ministry was set,
And thro' the dust of party, clash of creeds,
One face shone out to light him to the end,
And those pierced hands last seen on Olivet
Dowered him with passion for the people's needs,
And that great love which makes all sorrow friend.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION DAY.

The Leadership of the Risen Lord.

BY DR. LEE WOOLF, HACKNEY AND NEW COLLEGE,
LONDON.

'Go your way, tell his disciples and Peter that he goeth before you into Galilee.'—Mk 16⁷.

In the oldest manuscripts St. Mark's Gospel breaks off in the following verse, but the implication is that the disciples followed Jesus into Galilee and met Him there. The question immediately arises, however, as to the sense in which they followed Him from Jerusalem to the north. Obviously, if Jesus went into Galilee after His resurrection, He would not walk over the road through the hills and across the plains. Whatever means He may have employed, a supernatural element was present. And therefore, when the disciples followed Him, it was in a somewhat different sense from the time when, on the last journey to Jerusalem, Jesus went on in front, alone, and the disciples trod in His footsteps at some little distance behind.

But when we say that, after the Resurrection, they followed Jesus into Galilee, the word is in a somewhat different sense. It now bears the secondary meaning of going to the same place, but at a later period. It is true that they followed Him, but there is a certain amount of metaphor in the use of the word. This feature is still more prominent if we say that the disciples continued to follow Him after the Ascension when they obeyed His commandment and began trying to preach the gospel to every creature. What we mean now is that they followed Christ's line of life. They followed His ideals and His practical aims. They followed His commands in their own life and work, and, like Him, they sought to win men for the Kingdom of God.

We use the same language when we speak of

missionaries following Christ into India or Africa, or when we say that ordinary sincere Christians are followers of Christ.

All this is, of course, perfectly clear and indeed commonplace, and it is a real following. What is not so clear is the sense in which Jesus leads. By way of illustration let me quote briefly from an open letter written by a minister friend of mine to his people. He says: 'We must put ourselves under Christ's command, and obey His orders, cost what they may in self-sacrifice.' I agree, but I ask: How do we put ourselves under Christ's commands, how do we know what orders He issues for the details of our lives, and further, in what sense does Christ really exercise command to-day? Is Christ a real leader now? Is there such a thing for us as the real leadership of Christ?

In order to become clear, let us glance aside for a moment at other people who lead. There are two men very much to the forefront in the public eye just now: Mussolini in Italy and Roosevelt in America. We may differ widely in our opinion in regard to them, but we shall agree that they are real leaders followed by countless millions of their peoples. But what is the sense in which they lead? Relatively few Blackshirts have joined in procession, with Mussolini at their head, and still fewer Americans have ever seen President Roosevelt. But leadership is not always a question of marching at the head of processions, or even of having some one in sight. Rather, leaders are those who fire the imagination of other people, cause crowds to think in the same way as they themselves suggest. The followers accept the ideals, the ideas, and the methods of their leader. They get their inspiration and their strength of purpose from him. They adapt their plans and, to a large extent, submerge their wills in his. And it would be very ineffective and poor sort of leadership which could only be secure if the leader were personally present and if the followers did not use their own intelligence, energy, and initiative in furthering his objects. The real leader is one who can so inspire his people that man for man and also as a whole they endeavour to realize his aims and, indeed, are unable to distinguish them from their own.

Now in Christian theory, or Christian faith, call it which you prefer just now, that is essentially our position. Our Lord is a living Lord. He is not located in Jerusalem, or Rome, or Canterbury, or anywhere else on earth, but He is more truly present with a genuine Christian than Mussolini is present with Blackshirts in an obscure Italian

village, or Roosevelt with the farmers of the Middle-West. Vital belief in Christ means that Christ is personally present. He inspires us with ideas and ideals, and leads us to put certain things into practice. Of course it is true that the ideas and ideals are in a sense present or latent in us beforehand and that He calls out what is inherent in our souls, but the essence of His leadership is to be found in the fact that He unites our divided minds, shows us what we were really looking for but somehow could not see, and inspires us with faith that the higher effort is worth while. It is an ancient saying that the human heart is naturally Christian. You can indeed translate the gospel of Jesus into any language spoken by man, but it will still speak in its native tongue. Every Christian ideal, or principle, or dream is native to our hearts. In ancient days they called Jesus the Son of Man. The words mean but little to us to-day. We know Him as the Brother of man. He is the one who seems to understand us when we are open to His influence, better than we understand ourselves. The worst of us have elements within akin to the highest in Jesus. The words of the blessed gospel come to us from without, but there is always something within to which they can appeal if we are willing. No man is without his dreams, and in our best dreams we re-echo at once to the words of the Master. The words of Jesus claim authority over us, not merely because Jesus uttered them, but because we know within ourselves that they are true; we feel they belong to the nature of things. When Jesus said that the pure in heart should see God, we feel that it is so, that it must be so, and that anything else would be a lie. When He declared that our first duty is to seek the Kingdom of God, we know that we must if we are to be citizens of a moral universe. When He said that the greatest of all the Commandments is that we should love God with all our heart and soul, and love our neighbour as ourselves, we do not argue the point. There is nothing to argue. We must either obey, or be damned. The saintly men of Christian history and the great truths of the Christian tradition are not the peculiar products of a particular creed, but the authentic signs that in Jesus was the power of God unto moral sanity. He put His finger on the heart of things, and we know we cannot be wrong if we lay hold of the same fundamental truths and apply them in the same way. That is the leadership of Jesus.

But there is more. For Christian thoughts and feelings are not merely the thoughts and feelings of Christian people. They are the thoughts and

feelings which Christ sets on fire. Christian ideas are not simply ideas which Christian people possess, but ideas that Christ makes dynamic. Christian ways are not simply ways which Christians follow, but ways which Christ actually inspires and leads us to follow. The Christian spirit is not simply a spirit which you may find in any nice, good, kind, unselfish, religious people, but a spirit of love which Jesus pours into them continually, which controls and absorbs them, and makes them other than their own. There is, in fact, a constant stream of power coming into us from Him. In some quiet place, in some quiet moment, or even only in an inner silence and solitude, we can wait upon Him and all but feel His touch. In His presence, temptation ceases, uncertainty disappears, doubt fades, anxiety grows dim, and our course becomes clear. As the clouds break and the shadows flee away power returns and we begin inwardly to exult. Something within us seems to cry, 'I know whom I have believed, and am persuaded that he is able to keep that which I have committed unto him against that day.' Where He leads me I will follow. 'I press toward the mark for the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus.' Inward communion with Christ is a vital and precious experience through which He leads His disciples and they follow their beloved Lord.

To many of us this experience reaches one of its high points in observing the communion of the Lord's Supper. The essence of this service is not the ceremony itself, but the personal mystic fellowship into which it helps us to enter. The purpose of reading the Bible is that we might learn the ways of God with men, and might hear re-echoed the words that once rang in the vales of Galilee. The purpose of preaching is that the people might be instructed in divine things and challenged by their living truth. But when we have received all the knowledge and encouragement and challenge that written or spoken words can give us, there remains something that is beyond words. The helpfulness of the Communion Service is to be found exactly at this point. It is in the action which we all perform and in the rite which we celebrate together. We realize Christ to be mystically present, as always where even two or three meet in His name. If we devoutly adopt this attitude and wait upon Him, the living Lord can come mystically into our midst. As at His Last Supper before His crucifixion, so here He is the real host and we, like the ancient disciples, are the guests. When we eat the bread and drink the wine, He shares with us mystically in the act.

As He and His disciples anciently did this together, so we do it now. We share in the act with Him. And when it is all over, the result is that we have been with the Lord. This is the truth underlying what Roman Catholics call the 'Real Presence.' The real presence is for Him to be with us, and us to be with Him. We feel the common bonds uniting us to His very self when we eat the bread, just as He did. We feel the bonds uniting us to each other when we all drink of the same wine, just as the disciples did. And the atmosphere of the impending Cross, which overshadowed His betrayal night, is round about us. It helps us to surrender ourselves more completely to Him who loved and trusted God too much to count the sacrifice. It makes us feel again the tasks common to Him and to all who call themselves Christian. A new and holy love rises up towards Him. For His sake we would master and subdue ourselves, and bring everything in subjection to Him. In His name we would go into the world, and see if we can make it more as He would have it made. For love of Him, and faith in Him, we would lay all things under His feet. In loving joy, we find in Him the conquest of sin, the secret of pain bearing, the transmutation of disappointment, and the clue to a loving strength which never fails. We must go His way. Where He leads, we must follow, lest our hearts grow cold and we sin against the light. We must keep in His presence till He brings us to the gates of the Holy City.

WHITSUNDAY.

The Holy Spirit the Guide to Truth.

'These things have I spoken unto you, while yet abiding with you. But the Comforter, even the Holy Spirit, whom the Father will send in my name, he shall teach you all things, and bring to your remembrance all that I said unto you.'—Jn 14²⁶. (R.V.).

We sometimes shrink from all teaching regarding the Holy Spirit, for the way of His working passes our understanding. But though we cannot hope, while we are yet imprisoned in the body of sense, to comprehend the ways of God, there are yet many things regarding the Holy Spirit which, if we consider them, will bring the manner of His working out of the region of the supernormal into that of everyday experience. When we read of the day of Pentecost we are apt to be repelled as if we were reading a tale of some superheated imagination. But the revelation of the indwelling God that then flashed on the souls of men is in

line with the normal growth of human knowledge and power.

For it was not a new power that was then brought for the first time to bear upon men. The Holy Spirit had ever been with men, striving with them, flashing revelation on the soul of prophets and seers, and moving the hearts of men to seek after God. What happened was that the fullness of His power was revealed and the hearts of men were brought into unison with God. It happened then as has happened with all the power of God which men have been unable to use until the hour of revelation came. The world quivered from the beginning with the power of electricity, but men only shrank with terror before it as they heard the rumbling of heaven's artillery and saw the flash of the lightning that smote and killed. But at last a day came when the secret of that power was flashed on the mind of Faraday and its laws were discovered. And then that power which hitherto was unused and valueless became the servant of man. Cities were ere long illumined by it and messages flashed round the world. In the spiritual world that, also, was what happened when Jesus Christ revealed to men the working of the Holy Spirit.

Mr. Norman Macleod Caie in *The Secret of a Warm Heart* takes radium as a suggestive natural parable of God's Holy Spirit. It exerts amazing energy. While 12,000 tons of coal are needed to drive a steamer for 6000 miles at 15 knots, the same effect would be produced by 22 ounces of radium. The powers of illumination possessed by radium are also very remarkable, and it is capable of imparting its own luminosity to other bodies which are normally quite inactive. 'A small fraction of an ounce of radium,' it has been stated, 'would provide a good light sufficient for several rooms, which, during the present century, would never need renewing.'

In this text it is this aspect of the work of the Holy Spirit that we are particularly considering—the Holy Spirit as the Guide to truth.

The historical reality of Jesus Christ—that is, the principle of permanence in the Christian Church; but there is also a principle of progress. Although Jesus said as much as His disciples could remember, and even more than they could fully understand, to the very end He had to exercise a reserve of utterance not to overstrain their minds. As His teaching was the preparation of the Spirit's teaching, so was the Spirit's teaching the completion of His. But as the Father sends the Spirit in the name of Jesus, that is in accordance with the revelation of the Son, the Spirit's teaching is not an

addition to, or a substitute for, or a correction of, the teaching of Jesus. There is only one revelation of God as Father, and that is in the Son, and the function of the Spirit is to complete that revelation by interpreting and applying it according to the varied and varying needs of men and ages. 'He shall glorify me,' says Jesus, 'for he shall take of mine, and shall declare it unto you.'

This being the general function of the Spirit, what are the methods of His working in its discharge?

The Spirit brings to remembrance all that Jesus taught.

Can there be any doubt that we remember the sayings and doings of those in whom we are interested, as we do not those for whom we do not care? A friend's word of endearment, or a foe's utterance of scorn, is vividly remembered, it may be even as long as life lasts, as the speeches which have not touched our hearts are not. Because the Evangelist seems to have loved Jesus with a finer discernment, a keener sympathy, and a more intense devotion than the other disciples, he remembered more of the sayings of Jesus, and doubtless in after years, as he meditated on the wondrous life of which he had been a witness, moved by the Spirit, his reminiscences crowded upon him in more living reality, and under the Spirit's guidance, disclosed fresh meanings in these reflections which he has blended with his reminiscences.

The confirmation of the promise is written in the history of the Church. The revivals of the Church have been returns to Jesus. In Augustine, Francis of Assisi, Luther, things which had been forgotten in the Church were brought to remembrance by the Spirit's enlightening and quickening. We have in our own time witnessed just such a recovery of forgotten teaching of Jesus. The social aspects of our Lord's teaching, long ignored, are again coming to their own. We may be confident that in the future as in the past no occasion will arise in which the Spirit will not bring to remembrance some teaching of Jesus, the meaning of which has not been fully grasped hitherto, but which will be clearly understood when it is needed for the progress of the Kingdom of God. We might say that the sense of need is the reason why the discovery of the fresh meaning in the forgotten teaching is made; but, if we believe that the higher life of man is a partnership with God, we may gratefully acknowledge that it is not merely human discovery, but the Spirit's working in bringing to remembrance what is best suited to meet the immediate and urgent need.

The Spirit teaches all things by guiding into all the truth.

An extension is sometimes given to the words which the context in no way allows. Men have justified innovations in doctrine and practice by claiming that they were being guided by the Spirit of truth, even when these were inconsistent with, and contradictory of, the teaching of Jesus, the revelation of God's truth and grace. But the Spirit who is sent in the name of Christ illumines the mind of the Christian believer within, and not beyond, the range of the truth as it is in Jesus.

The danger of a wayward subjectivity under cover of the claim of the Spirit's guidance has unhappily led the Church to seek safety in some ecclesiastical organization as the authority in creed and code, on the ground that such an organization is the only legitimate organ of the Spirit's illumination. But councils and synods, as we look back in the history of the Church, have so often erred that it would be rash folly to claim for them infallibility. Sometimes the solitary saint now appears to us as the one organ for his age of the Spirit's activity. The Spirit is the Holy Spirit, and He is the Spirit of truth. Sanctity and sincerity are essential to the man who would be the organ of the Spirit; and in the long run it is the reason and conscience of the Christian community as a whole, and not any of its ecclesiastical organizations, which can test the claim of any man to speak by and for the Spirit of God. It is Christian experience and Christian character which alone guarantee the presence and the operation of the Spirit of God in any individual and in any community. The Christian Church may confidently expect to be guided by the Spirit into all the truth, but it must be prepared to fulfil the conditions of such guidance in an intenser piety and a more elevated morality; for only thus can the Holy Spirit, the Spirit of truth, dwell and work within its thought and life.¹

TRINITY SUNDAY.

Three Central Beliefs.

'Behold, he smote the rock, that the waters gushed out, and the streams overflowed; can he give bread also? can he provide flesh for his people?'—Ps 78²⁰.

'The grace of the Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Ghost.'—2 Co 13¹⁴.

Writing of the message of G. A. Studdert Kennedy, the Archbishop of York says: 'I do not think I

¹ A. E. Garvie, *The Master's Comfort and Hope*, 193.

ever heard him mention the doctrine of the Trinity in set terms, but no one has ever held a fuller Trinitarian belief. To most Christians one of the Persons is less in the primary focus of attention than the others; but to him the Three Persons were equally real; the worship of his whole being was equally given to each.'

This Trinity Sunday we shall consider the three central beliefs which its truth comprises. First, God is the ultimate reality, and this reality is Spirit and Person. To this conclusion we of these later days are being led by the teachings of science and philosophy. The scientists assure us that analysis of the world of matter, and the psychologists assure us that analysis of our own mental faculties for coming into contact with the world of matter, alike prevent us from supposing that this world is ultimate and abiding. Our senses tell us of a world which at first impression seems to have all the qualities of hard reality. Men may come and go, but the world abides. But long ago the spiritual instincts of men bade them reverse this relation. The material world is not abiding. That which alone is eternal is spirit. 'They shall perish, but thou endurest.'

And this early conviction of the transitoriness of the world has not only been confirmed by the researches of the men of science, but has been reinforced by the even more startling truth of the unreality of the world as compared with the deeper reality of that which is spiritual. The world which we think that we know is not, they tell us, a world of reality. The matter to which we attribute solidity and finality is nothing but so many centres of electrical force in motion. The knowledge which we suppose ourselves to have of a world outside ourselves is not knowledge of things as they really exist: it is knowledge to which our own brain has imparted so much that we are not in a position to say how much of it is due to our own picture-weaving consciousness, and how much to something in the nature of fact lying outside ourselves.

Moreover, this knowledge of the world, partial and imperfect as it is, is extremely unsatisfying. The world as thus presented to us is a world of facts—hard, concrete, solid—to be tabulated, classified, registered. And this satisfies but a small part of our complex being. We can know something of this world, but we cannot enter into fellowship with it. Still less can we worship and adore it. Men speak about communion with Nature. But the Nature which they mean is not the Nature of hard fact reported to them by their senses, but the Nature to which they attribute personality, from

which they infer, and deduce, personal being. The ultimate reality, then, of which we form part must be personal in nature. It must be what personality in ourselves implies, being which has freedom, which can reason, and purpose, and will, and love. Thus, we believe in God, the ultimate reality, as a 'Father, who made heaven and earth.'

And, secondly, we learn how we come into contact with this ultimate reality. Not through Nature. From that which is material personality cannot be known, though it may be guessed or inferred. Even if the inference were certain, the characteristics of the being so inferred would remain unknown. Nature hides as much as she reveals.

Nor do we come into contact with this hidden God by groping in the dark abyss of our own personality. Whatever truth there may be in the thought of God as immanent in man, it is at least not true that human nature can find more than obscure traces of God within itself until it receive anew the Spirit of God. If Nature partly hides Him; if our own consciousness fails to perceive Him, because it is so occupied in taking note of that which is material through its sense perceptions; if He, being personal, can only reveal Himself to personalities, and that not through anything merely material, how can communion take place? We shall say that He communicated Himself to the saints of the Old Testament, and in some sense to many others outside that people. Yes, but how inadequate was that revelation! The history of mankind is sufficient to show that the pre-Christian working of the Spirit of God upon the souls of men was only sufficiently comprehended to drive them to crave for more perfect knowledge of Him.

Here comes in the doctrine of the Incarnation. That men might come to full knowledge of Himself, God brought Himself within the range of their perceptions by taking human nature in the Person of Jesus Christ. He did not merely proclaim what God was, such as that He is the truth and light, but He manifested these qualities of God in His own Person. Thus, we believe in 'Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord,' How great a thing is this revelation! But of what use is it? Knowledge about God is not communion with God. How can we come into union with that life which we see? We want to live that life, to will that will, to be what Christ was, the very God in human life. How can our life become His, and His ours?

He smote the stony rock of human nature, and there have gushed out streams of Divine life; but

can He provide bread also, and feed our souls with His very life?

And so, thirdly, God, thus Incarnate, communicates to men the life which He reveals to them. But how? By death. The life revealed to a few in the earthly life of Jesus Christ is made available for the whole world of men by the risen and ascended Jesus. There came into the world His Spirit. Not, of course, merely His influence. It is strange that men should ever have supposed that it is easy to conceive of the Spirit as a merely impersonal influence. No, it was the personal Spirit of God. And thus we believe in 'the Holy Ghost.' And being the Spirit of God Incarnate in Christ, He is the very Spirit of the God-Man Jesus Christ. Thus, God has provided bread for His people, the Bread which is He who came down out of heaven, and gave Himself for the life of the world.¹

And now let us recall that the important matter is not the orthodoxy of our doctrine, but the richness of our personal experience of God. In American railway stations there is a functionary who with the aid of a megaphone announces outgoing trains, naming their destinations and stops and the track where they may be boarded. On an oppressive summer day one will hear the announcer in a city terminal calling to the waiting travellers the enticing names of mountain and seaside resorts and summoning them to entrain. But the announcer himself will stay in the sweltering station, without glimpse of forest or ocean, without a breath of their quickening air, and his life long he will not likely visit more than half a dozen of the places which he mentions glibly several times a day.

Paul, summing up the blessing of God, speaks of 'the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit.' He says, 'through Jesus we have our access in one Spirit unto the Father.' In these words generations of believers have summed up their intercourse with the Divine. Have we entered into the fullness of their fellowship with God? Do we know Him as our Father? This does not mean merely that we accept the idea of His kinship with our spirits and trust His kindly disposition towards us; but that we let Him establish a direct line of paternity with us and father our impulses, our thoughts, our ideals, our resolves.

Further, we cannot, according to Jesus, be in sonship with this Father save as we are in true brotherhood with all His children. God is (to employ a colloquial phrase) 'wrapped up' in His sons and daughters, and only as we love and serve

them are we loving and serving Him. In Jesus' summary of the Law He combined two apparently conflicting obligations, when He said, 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with *all* thy heart, *and* thou shalt love thy neighbour.' If a man loves God with his all, how can there be any remainder of love to devote to some one else? What we do for any man—the least, the last, the lost—we do for God. We do not know Him as Father until we possess the obligating sense of our kinship with all mankind, and say, 'Our Father.'

Mr. Lionel Blackburne, the financial expert, said in *Lloyds Bank Monthly Review*: 'It may well be that a root cause of our discomfiture is to be found in a neglect of the teaching of the Founder of Christianity. . . Can the modern world accept Christianity as a way of life? Can we trust it to remodel the conduct of international affairs as it has undoubtedly done in regard to such matters as the property of man in man, the dominance of class over class, and the establishment of individual worth and freedom? As we answer these questions so will our fate be.'

Galsworthy in his *First Thoughts on War* wrote: 'The idealist said in his heart, "The God of force is dead, or dying." He has been proven the fool that the man of affairs and the militarist always said he was. But the fools of this world—generally after they are gone—have a way of moving men which the wise and practical believers in force have not. . . . The battle between the God of love and the God of force endures for ever. Fools of the former camp, drowned out and beaten to their knees in due time, will get up again and plant their little flag a little farther on. "All men are brothers," said the German Schiller; so shall the fools say again when the time comes; and again, and again, after every beating.'

Do we know God in the Son? There is a sense in which Jesus is the 'First Person' in the Christian Trinity. Our approach to God begins with Him. In St. Paul's familiar benediction, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ precedes the love of God. We know God's love only as we experience the grace of Jesus. We cannot experience that grace except as we let Jesus be Lord.

Do we know God in the Spirit? His incarnation in Jesus evidences His 'incarnability,'² and His eagerness to have His fulness dwell in every son who will receive Him. To know God in the Spirit is so to follow Jesus that we share His sonship with the Father and have Him abiding in us, working through us His works, manifesting Himself in our mortal lives. .

¹ W. C. Allen, *The Christian Hope*, 77.

Sir Edward Burne-Jones once wrote : ' That was an awful word of Ruskin's, that artists paint God for the world. There's a lump of greasy pigment at the end of Michael Angelo's hog-bristle brush, and by the time it has been laid on the stucco, there is something there that all men with eyes recognize as Divine. Think what it means : it is the power of bringing God into the world—making God manifest ! ' ¹

FIRST SUNDAY AFTER TRINITY.

Love banishes Fear.

' Perfect love casteth out fear.'—1 Jn 4¹⁸.

Tradition and art have given a touch of effeminacy to the character of St. John which, however, is not justified by anything in his history. True, he was ' the disciple whom Jesus loved '—that was his supreme distinction. But the ardour of his Galilean temper was such that he, with his brother, St. James, received from Christ the remarkable surname Boanerges—Sons of Thunder. The intensity of his love for Christ was not the index of an effeminate, but of a strong, nature ; for the constancy of a deep and passionate love is never found in a nature that is not strong. We do not count Dante weak because his whole life centred in Beatrice. Rather, we find in this peculiar intensity of passion the sign of a nature all aflame and full of power. A truly great love is at all times as impossible to men of feeble nature as the capacity for truly heroic deeds.

' Love,' says Thomas à Kempis, ' feels no burdens, regards not labours, would willingly do more than it is able, pleads not impossibility, because it feels that it can and may do all things.'

May we not wonder if, when St. John wrote the text, he had in his mind an incident which is told us by Clement of Alexandria, and which probably is substantially true? He relates that before John's imprisonment in Patmos the Apostle had chosen a youth of brilliant promise for an office of trust in the churches. When he returned, he found that this youth had betrayed his trust so deeply that he had become the captain of a company of bandits. Alone but fearless, unarmed except by the panoply of love, the aged Apostle entered the gloomy defile of the mountains where this robber horde was concealed, allowed himself to be seized and taken into the presence of their leader, who was overwhelmed with horror at the appearance of his former master. At first he fled. Then, softened

and penetrated by the Apostle's appeals, he fell at his feet, bewailed his apostasy, and was led back by the hand of the aged disciple to the tasks he had neglected, and the honourable life he had forsworn. Love for Christ, and for the youth who belonged to Christ, cast out fear in the aged Apostle ; and this strong, fearless love called compellingly to strength in the youth—strength that would be tried indeed in an age when the persecutions of Domitian were sweeping like a tornado of fury over those infant churches and decimating them.

It may be helpful, too, to wonder if, when John wrote the text, he had in his mind the life of his friend Peter. Our Lord, on His first meeting with Simon, called him a ' rock.' Did He see signs of the shifting sand in him, signs of timidity in him, even then, and, according to His gracious custom, try to develop what was lacking in his nature by means of a new name?

Simon broke down, to his own deep sorrow, in the courtyard of Annas's palace, because of a public opinion which was adverse to him, and because of the dim sense he had of some impending danger. In every direction around him were Roman soldiers moving about ; in the uncertain light of midnight, shadows came and went. There was much talking around the charcoal braziers where they gathered for warmth that cold night. And, when Peter was suddenly accused of being a disciple of Jesus by one of the maid-servants, before he knew what he was doing he had denied his Lord.

Yet, in Peter, fear was cast out. How? What was Christ's way? Not many days after, when the two met again beside the dawn-lit sea, the talk turned on the tasks of, and on power for, the new life. ' Lovest thou me? ' asked Jesus ; and the word refers to a love of the loftiest kind which seeks to give rather than to possess. Nor did He stay His questions that probed to the last coil of being, until the response of Peter showed that he had the right kind of love. ' Lord, thou knowest all things : thou knowest that I love thee.' That was the secret ! And Peter became the ' rock ' standing amidst the drift that Christ saw in him from the first. For Peter, the life to which he was restored might have its disappointments, renunciations, fiery trials ; upon it there might rest the shadow of a cross. But love was sufficient for these things.

And our love for Christ, and for His wandering children, will carry us through all our timidities to redemptive life and service—even as it made the young Scottish girl, Mary Slessor, too timid to cross a busy Glasgow street alone, into the fearless

¹ H. S. Coffin, *Some Christian Convictions*, 129 ff.

missionary in Calabar who had such an influence over the natives that she was known as the White Queen.

'Undoubtedly St. John is thinking here that the test of the new birth is whether Godlike love is in our hearts. He sets forth love and selfishness as two opposing ways of life for the spirit. 'The selfish life, individual in its scheme of things, concerned with getting, consumed with the unappeasable fire of desire, is doomed to failure—outside the life of God, outside the true life of men, spiritually alone. Fear is its portion, and its portion for ever. Selfishness spells fear. Its logical conclusion is the Ishmaelite type of life—a hand against every man's, and every man's hand against his. Peace is an impossibility. Suspicion and distrust are the atmosphere it breathes. The selfish life cannot look forward with calm confidence to the future; for it has not laid up treasure there. And, even in the present, fear has punishment. It ever tastes it in anticipation. It is its own scourge.' The selfish life lives under a reign of terror. Listen to the exceeding bitter cry of Olive Schreiner in her great spiritual confession, *The Story of an African Farm*, 'Why am I alone, so hard, so cold? It is eating my soul to the core, self, self, self! I cannot bear this life! I cannot breathe! I cannot live! Will nothing free me from myself? I want something great and pure to lift me to itself.' A life without God, without love, is the most fearful of all failures. The Greek from which comes the word 'idiot' signifies merely a private person. But the idea of

detachment and self-centredness has so gathered around the word that to us it means a man incapable of interests outside himself. Self-isolation is the root of idiocy. Selfish living is suicide by slow starvation.

'Love,' says St. John, 'is of God; and every one that loveth is born of God, and knoweth God.' The test of life is love. The task of life is the perfecting of love. Life blossoms into its natural fruition in love, as the fruits of the orchard ripen into perfect form and bloom in the sunshine. To dwell in love is to dwell in God, and to have God dwelling in us. And one result of love made perfect is absence of fear.

Here we live in the faith of St. Bernard: 'Nothing can work me damage, except myself. The harm that I sustain I carry about in me: and never am a real sufferer but by my own fault.' They who dwell in love and in God, and who have God dwelling in them stand up with no bandage on the eyes, no opiate in the brain, and look death full in the face, seeing past its grim delusions. The day of life is passed with a calm and cheerful heart. The day of death is welcomed, as Carlyle said John Stirling welcomed it, 'without a thought of fear and with very much of hope'; or as Charles Kingsley welcomed it, 'God forgive me, but I look forward to it with an intense and reverent curiosity.' These men were sure that more loving and gracious surprises were in store, because as Christ is, so is the soul that is in Christ.¹

¹ C. Kellett, *The Terrible Meek*, 122.

The Church and the Kingdom of God: Need for Discrimination.

BY THE REVEREND E. C. BLACKMAN, M.A., CHESHUNT COLLEGE, CAMBRIDGE.

THE following is a comparison, based on New Testament usage, of the conceptions Kingdom of God and Church; with a resultant denial of their identity and a plea for careful distinction of the two terms. Both conceptions are central and constitutive in our thinking as they were for the first Christian generation. The object of an inquiry into the New Testament evidence is to discover whether they are constitutive for us in the

same sense in which they were for those first Christians.

It is not denied that Church and Kingdom of God have something in common. What emerges from this study is the fact that they are to be more often distinguished than identified. Roman Catholics to-day as in the Middle Ages maintain the identification. This goes back to Augustine's equation of Church with the *Civitas Dei*: the

Church was God's kingdom erected in the midst of earthly kingdoms and entrusted with the task of making them conform to God's laws.¹ But the identification is not peculiar to Roman Catholics. It is to be found, among recent Protestant scholars, in Fairbairn² and Denney.³ To quote Fairbairn: 'The Kingdom is the immanent Church, and the Church is the explicated Kingdom, and nothing alien to either can be in the other. . . . The Church is the kingdom done into living souls and the society they constitute.' 'The kingdom is the Church viewed from above; the Church is the kingdom seen from below.'

Apparently it is the theologians who make this identification. And to them we may add the hymn-writers. Think, for example, of such a verse as:

I love Thy Kingdom, Lord,
The house of Thine abode,
The Church our blest Redeemer saved
With His own precious blood.

Among the Reformers Calvin in particular thought of the Church as the Kingdom of Christ, because Christ rules the Church, and the laws of His Kingdom are the institutions and disciplinary acts of the Church.⁴ This is different from a conception of the Church as the kingdom of God, but it shows the possibility that in the writers just quoted we have the influence of this Reformation theology. We go on to ask whether the language of the New Testament itself allows the identification of Church and Kingdom of God to pass unquestioned.

We may start from the well-known fact that the word *ekklesia*, 'church,' which is so frequent in the Epistles, occurs only twice in the Gospels; *basileia*, 'kingdom,' on the other hand, is found on almost every page of the Synoptic Gospels, but is comparatively infrequent in the rest of the New Testament. One inference is that in the teaching of Jesus the Church occupied a very small place, but the Kingdom a central place; whereas in the experience of the early Christians the idea of the Church is central, and the Kingdom is relegated to a less important place. This might mean that the

Christians had failed to comprehend the Lord's teaching about the Kingdom. Or the explanation may be the one given by Fairbairn, that New Testament writers had by no means lost or outgrown Jesus' teaching about the Kingdom of God; only they expressed it by the other term, *ekklesia*, because for them the outpouring of the Spirit and the consequent beginning of the Church seemed to be the fulfilling of Jesus' words concerning the coming of the Kingdom; the Kingdom was manifestly breaking in, even as the Lord had said, and in their assemblies they really did 'taste the powers of the Age to come.' In Fairbairn's words: 'Jesus preaches the kingdom—i.e. as King declares Himself, proclaims the kingdom constituted by the presence of the King; but the Apostles, by founding churches, edify the Church, call men to enter the society of the saved.' This is the explanation with which we are concerned here. It has much to recommend it, but is misleading for several reasons.

In the first place, it does not tally with the use of *basileia* in the Epistles. The infrequency of its occurrence outside the Gospels is not parallel to the infrequency of *ekklesia* in the Gospels. The thirty-six instances of *basileia* outside the Gospels are sufficient to show that the meaning which the term had for Jesus was not lost by His later disciples. It is used eight times in Acts in a sense quite consonant with the teaching of Jesus. For the present aspect of the Kingdom as emphasized by Jesus we may compare Ro 14¹⁷, 1 Co 4²⁰, 1 Th 2¹², He 1⁸. Of the future aspect of the Kingdom also fourteen instances may be counted.⁵ It must therefore be admitted that when the Epistles use the expression Kingdom of God they mean what the Lord Himself had meant by it, and do not make it an alternative for *ekklesia*. There are only three places where *basileia* could with any probability be taken as equivalent to *ekklesia*. Col 1¹³ speaks of God's transference of men from darkness into the *basileia* of His Son: it is possible, but not natural, to understand this as 'into the Church.' In Col 4¹¹ Paul mentions fellow-workers 'for the Kingdom of God': here it is still less natural to interpret 'for the Church.' The third passage is Rev 1⁶, where, however, the reference is to a temporary kingdom of the martyrs, not to the Church. The passages just mentioned which refer to the *basileia* as future are decisive against any equation of *basileia* and *ekklesia*. From Acts we learn that 'the Kingdom' or 'the things of the Kingdom' were the content

¹ Ergo ecclesia et nunc est regnum Christi regnumque caelorum (*De Civitate Dei*, xx. 9). See further J. N. Figgis, *The Political Aspects of S. Augustine's 'City of God'*, 69 ff.

² *Christ in Modern Theology*, 528 f.

³ *Studies in Theology*, 180-186.

⁴ cf. Seeberg, *Dogmengeschichte*, iv. ii. 613: 'As God's general government of the world expresses itself in laws, so Christ governs the Church by means of such institutions.'

⁵ 1 Co 6⁹, 10 15²⁴, 50, Gal 5²¹, Eph 5⁶, 2 Th 1⁶, 2 Ti 4¹, 18, Ja 2⁵, 2 P 1¹¹, Rev 1⁹ 12¹⁰.

of much mission preaching. This use of 'kingdom' would mean the Church only incidentally.¹

It has been argued² that Matthew identified the Church and the Kingdom. This seems fairly clear, especially in the case of the Parable of the Drag-net, and there is no reason for doubting that some Christians did see in the fact of the Church the beginnings of the Kingdom. Doubtless the consciousness of membership with others in an *ekklesia* both helped Christians to understand the Lord's words about the Kingdom of God, and inclined them to see in their *ekklesia* the preparatory settlements of the Kingdom. But the assumption is not thereby justified that the identification of Church and Kingdom reflects the common belief of New Testament writers.

A pertinent conclusion is drawn by K. L. Schmidt at the end of a lexicon article on *basileia*: 'The apostolic and sub-apostolic Church of the New Testament seldom spoke explicitly of the Kingdom of God, but by implication frequently drew attention to this Kingdom by pointing to the Lord Jesus Christ. It is not the case that speech about the Church had taken the place of Jesus' preaching about the Kingdom of God. Rather is it the case that belief in the Kingdom of God was maintained in post-Resurrection experience of Christ.'³

The examination of linguistic evidence, to be complete, should take account not only of the usage of *basileia*, but also of that of *ekklesia*; for, granted that no instance can be found of *basileia* in the sense of church, is it not possible that *ekklesia* does occur in the sense of kingdom? Here it must suffice to say that the hundred and three occurrences of *ekklesia* with the meaning 'Christian community' divide themselves into two groups according as the sense is universal or local. It is with the former group alone that we are concerned, since no one would argue that the Kingdom is to be equated with a local congregation of Christians. Eighteen passages thus claim our attention.⁴ Detailed discussion is, however, unnecessary, because in no

case is the interpretation of *ekklesia* as Kingdom of God the obvious and natural one. The usage in Ephesians is certainly notable, and it is upon this usage that writers like Fairbairn rely. But the word cannot be confined to this 'later-Pauline or mystical sense' (Fairbairn's phrase). Denney also was forced to distinguish the ideal church from the actual, and by giving prominence to the ideal he was able to make the equation of Church and Kingdom plausible. But it is not only of this ideal church which has no spot or wrinkle that the New Testament speaks. The New Testament often spells Church with a small 'c.'

Recent scholarship is pointing out that the Kingdom of God means essentially the Divine activity, God's sovereignty or kingship. Thus it is not on the same plane of meaning with Church. It is with the derived meaning of Kingdom—its manifestation in a community—that Church is confused and mistakenly identified. Their fundamental incompatibility becomes clear as soon as it is realized that Jesus embodies the Divine ruling activity and also is in some sense the founder of the Church.⁵ 'Christ, in whom God exercises His sovereign activity, is the creator of the Church, which is neither identical with, nor a substitute for, the Kingdom; but first of all the object of this Divine activity, and then the organ, the instrument God makes and uses for His ends.'⁶ In the remainder of this essay the word 'kingdom' is used in the derived sense of the society in which the Divine rule is actualized. It is part of our Christian faith that this society must ultimately be established.

Strictly speaking, *ekklesia* means 'the people,' i.e. the citizens of the Kingdom rather than the Kingdom itself. As Fairbairn points out, 'In the Kingdom the King is emphasized, in the Church the citizens.'

But the Kingdom and the Church are not altogether on the same time-level. The Kingdom has a present as well as a future aspect; but such a twofold sense is not so definitely established for the Church. The Kingdom of God is primarily a future reality, an ideal; the Church began as a present fact. The Kingdom indeed came to be conceived as also in a certain sense a present reality, and similarly the idea of the Church was extended to include not only the present, empirical, militant society of

¹ Lake (on Ac 1³) allows that in every case the Church may be intended, 'but in none is the earlier eschatological meaning excluded by the context.'

² e.g. in *Beginnings of Christianity*, i. 330 f. The evidence is Mt 13⁴⁷ 16¹⁹. The learned editors would also interpret Mt 11¹¹ ('He that is least in the kingdom of God is greater than he') as an instance in Q of the identification of Church and Kingdom: the lowliest church member is greater than John the Baptist.

³ Kittel's *Wörterbuch*, i. 591.

⁴ 1 Co 10³³ 12³⁰ 15⁹, Gal 1¹³, Ph 3⁶, Col 1¹⁰. ²⁴, 1 Ti 3¹⁵, He 12²⁸, and all the occurrences in Ephesians (9 times).

⁵ That Jesus founded the Church does not depend on the authenticity of Mt 16¹⁸.

⁶ Garvie in *Essays Congregational and Catholic*, 183, quoting Gloege. On Gloege's recent book *Kingdom of God and Church*, see Newton Flew's valuable discussion in *THE EXPOSITORY TIMES*, Feb. 1935.

Christians in the world, but also the future, glorified, triumphant fellowship of Christians in heaven. But essentially Church and Kingdom are to be distinguished as present and future respectively. According to the New Testament the Church is the community of those who through union with Christ are already fit to enter the Kingdom of God. In virtue of having died and risen again with Christ they already possess 'the resurrection mode of existence,'¹ but the resurrection life is not yet theirs; it is still a hope. Membership of the Church is a present fact; the resurrection and the Kingdom are a future hope.² For although in the teaching of Jesus the Kingdom of God is present as well as future, later Christians tended to think of it as future only. The present aspect of it for them was their inclusion in the Church, but this was now regarded as their preparation for the Kingdom, and the Kingdom itself lay in the future, the object of hope and prayer.

A further distinction: The Kingdom is other-worldly, the Church is this-worldly. It is not denied that both encroach on one another's land, so to speak. The Kingdom can be regarded as breaking in to the present world-order, and the Church as continuing its existence in a higher order of reality, in heaven. It may, however, be urged that there is no church in the strict sense other than the one in this world. We express a fact, and an important fact, when we speak of the Church triumphant by contrast with the Church militant; but that involves a transformation of the meaning of 'church.' By Church triumphant is meant the consummated fellowship of the saints, the ultimate divine society which is to be revealed at the end of time when the warfare against all that opposes the Divine will is accomplished. But the proper term for this is Kingdom of God, and the term Church is incorrect. For the Church is properly the society of those in this world who do God's will and wait for His Kingdom.

The New Testament passage which might be cited against this is He 12²⁸, where, however, a correct exegesis precludes any doctrine of a church in heaven being based on the verse. In the first place, *ekklesia* is not here used in the regular New Testa-

ment sense of 'church,' and it should be translated 'congregation' or 'assembly' (so Moffatt). In the second place, the 'first-born' are living men, contrasted with the angels; their names are written in heaven, but they are still on the earth.

There is no future Church. The Church is the fellowship of living believers, and this is not the same as the communion of saints in heaven. New Testament usage protests against such popular theology as that of the hymn-writer who makes us sing:

One Church above, beneath;
Though now divided by the stream,
The narrow stream of death.

And also against the Christianized Platonism which believes in a heavenly church of which the Church on earth is a copy.³

The New Testament knows nothing of the distinction between the visible and invisible Church. That distinction is a necessary corollary of an emphasis on predestination, but the New Testament teaching about predestination differs from later doctrines in that the Elect are not yet distinguished from the whole number of Christians. Every Christian, *qua* church member, is one of the Elect. Even those troublesome Christians at Corinth were potentially elect. Paul had to admit that not all the 'saints' were 'spiritual' or 'perfect.' But notice how he deals with them: he does not warn them by making a distinction between a visible church, of which they are members, and an invisible church, from which they are excluded; he tells them frankly they will not have a place in the Kingdom of God!

To the early Christians the entry of converts into the Church must have appeared as a fulfilment of some of Jesus' words about the Kingdom. Had not the Lord said the Kingdom was at hand, that it was like leaven, that some of His disciples should see it before they died? This does not mean that the early Christians identified the Church with the Kingdom. Modern Christians, too, must reject the identification. We may allow that Church and Kingdom are to some extent coterminous, in so far as the Church to-day is the society of those who make God King in their lives. We retain something of the primitive Christian belief that the Kingdom was already breaking in, but with us the intensity of that conviction is lacking. The consummated Kingdom is for us not imminent, but in a more or

¹ Schweitzer's phrase. Cf. *The Mysticism of Paul the Apostle*, 116-120.

² This is well brought out in the *Didache*, ch. 10, where we find the prayer that the Church may be gathered from the four winds 'into Thy *basileia* which Thou hast prepared for it.' The Kingdom is here clearly not a synonym for the Church, but the Church's destiny.

³ This begins, I believe, with Clement of Alexandria. Cf. *Strom.*, iv. 8, where he speaks of the earthly church being the 'image' of the heavenly.

less distant future. This cooling of conviction has not only transformed our outlook on the future, but has made it increasingly difficult to believe that the boundaries of the Church are the limits within which the Kingdom is establishing itself. Unless we are Roman Catholics we are not tempted to equate Church and Kingdom. We hardly even regard the Church as the preliminary settlements of the Kingdom. The utmost we can say is that the Church is the sphere in and through which the Kingdom of God wins potential citizens.

The present dimensions of the Kingdom are invisible except to God. Here the distinction between visible and invisible may be pressed into service. What is meant by the invisible Church may be described as the Kingdom in its present aspect, whereas the Church is only properly to be spoken of as visible. But, as has been pointed out, the New Testament does not make this distinction. When the New Testament says *ekklesia* it means 'visible Church.' If it means invisible Church, it says simply 'the Elect.'

Joshua's Long Day.

BY THE REVEREND C. STANLEY THOBURN, S.T.B., A.M., NAINI-TAL, U.P., INDIA.

Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon;
And thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon.
And the sun stood still, and the moon stayed,
Until the nation had avenged themselves of their
enemies.—Jos 10¹²⁻¹³.

WHAT really happened? Did the sun and moon literally stand still, the whole process of the earth's revolution being retarded by a miracle? Or are we to regard this part of the story of Joshua's battle with the Amorites as quite legendary? Is it just the language of poetry or of religious fervour which has embellished the story with a striking figure of speech, so that we should understand it as meaning no more than that, in the enthusiasm of victory, Joshua felt that Yahweh had given him power sufficient to command even the physical universe? Or was there some striking, though natural, phenomenon of the sun and moon which inspired the ancient poet to preserve the memory of the event in the above lines? On the one hand, our modern knowledge of the uniformity of the processes of Nature makes it extremely difficult to believe that God interrupted the regular course of the solar system by a miracle, as the writer of the latter part of Jos 10¹³ implies. To be sure, it has been claimed on appeal to modern scientific authority that a whole day has been found missing at the time that Joshua lived, but the arguments seem to be those of religious rationalizing rather than of impartial inquiry, and therefore unconvincing. On the other hand, the account seems to bear the marks of history rather than legend in all particulars other than the matter of sun and moon,

and yet, strange to say, it is just this feature of the Hebrew victory which has been preserved to us in this quotation from the lost Book of Yashar. Furthermore, to explain the words as only a figure of speech seems inadequate. A figure of speech would seem to require a more imaginative and general cast: these words are too much fixed to earthly realities, for Gibeon and Aijalon are well-identified places in Palestine. If, again, a natural phenomenon is the explanation of the sun and moon standing still, it ought to be possible to observe a similar occurrence under favourable circumstances. The following is an account of an attempt to discover such circumstances and reproduce the essentials of the Joshuanic solstice.

The explanation of Joshua's Long Day herein given had its origin in a personal experience in India. I was going on foot from Naini-Tal, in the foothills of the Himalayas, to Kathgodam, the railway terminus on the plains below. In order to catch my train I had to start before sunrise. As I went on my way, I hoped to reach a certain motor road before the sun should fully rise. But the sun began to come up over a hill across the valley from me sooner than I had expected, and the shadow of the hill moved more rapidly than I (the name of the hill was Gwaldam, I believe¹). Not to be beaten so easily, I quickened my pace, then ran, and thus managed to keep up with the shadow. It so happened that I had been reading the story of Joshua not long before and had reflected on how much of the story could be regarded as historical.

¹ I am not certain of the name, however.

Like a flash it occurred to me that possibly Joshua was running down a hill like myself at the time when the sun 'stood still,' so, imitating Joshua, I said to the sun, 'Sun, stand thou still on Gwaldam until I reach the motor road!' And the sun stood still on the brow of Gwaldam just as long as I had breath enough to keep up with the shadow of the hill. The shadow got to the motor road before me in spite of my efforts, because it could take short-cuts on the hillside which I could not, but I ran far enough to prove to my own satisfaction that the sun could be made to 'stand still' on this simple principle. The new idea became more intriguing than my desire to reach the motor road.

But Joshua had the moon standing still also—and at the same time as the sun. That made an interesting problem. As I thought over the factors involved, however, I believed it would be possible to have the sun stand still in the east and the moon in the west if one were running down a valley that kept opening westward. The sun would then stand still on the same general idea as had occurred with me, while the moon, which would be setting instead of rising, would keep appearing in the V of the valley as it opened westward. Upon examining a map of Palestine, I was gratified to find that the valley of Aijalon runs almost due east and west for a distance, thus making this explanation of the long day worth considering further. If I ever get an opportunity to go to Palestine, I thought, I would like to run down the valley of Aijalon to see whether the sun and moon would stand still for me as they did for Joshua. The opportunity came. I lived in Jerusalem for several months, and, among other things, ran down the valley of Aijalon.

Returning to the details of Joshua's battle, let us notice the circumstances under which the sun and moon stood still. Before I could try the experiment, I had to be sure of the exact location and conditions as far as possible. Fortunately, the proper names concerned are well identified. There seems to be no doubt that Gibeon is El-Jib, that Aijalon is Yalo, and the valley of Aijalon the modern Wady Selman, that Upper and Lower Beth-Horon are Beit Ur el-Fauqa and Beit Ur et-Tahta. Azekah is identified with Tel Zakariya, near Wady Sunt. The Gilgal in the account is undoubtedly the Gilgal near Jericho, in the Jordan valley. Makkedah alone seems uncertain. It is probably to be located farther down the course of Wady Selman towards the coastal plain. The course which Joshua took when he attacked and pursued the Amorites is given in diagram in

Professor Garstang's book on Joshua and Judges.¹ Joshua was at Gilgal in the Jordan valley when an urgent call for help came from the Gibeonites, who had secured an alliance with the Hebrews by strategy. Then Joshua 'went up from Gilgal all the night' (Jos 10⁸) and made a surprise attack upon the Amorites somewhere in the neighbourhood of Gibeon (he 'came upon them suddenly'). The Amorites then fled down the valley of Aijalon, which has been one of the great highways from ancient times between the highlands above and the Shephelah below. Reaching the lower end of the valley gorge, they seem to have parted into two groups, one fleeing over the Shephelah hills southward to Azekah, and the other fleeing on down the valley of Aijalon to Makkedah. Professor Garstang points out that the course of the flight from the highlands to the Shephelah was probably not through the towns of Upper and Lower Beth-Horon, which lie slightly north of the main course of Wady Selman, but by way of Wady Selman itself. The 'ascent of Beth-Horon' (v.¹⁰) and the 'descent of Beth-Horon' are probably to be regarded as referring to a place in the course of Wady Selman where one may turn off to go to Beth-Horon; this because the fleeing Amorites would certainly have taken the most direct and easiest route to the Shephelah, which is by way of Wady Selman itself. The text does not necessarily imply that the pursuit passed through the towns themselves. Whether the 'ascent of Beth-Horon' refers to the place where one may turn off from Wady Selman to Beit Ur el-Fauqa or to Beit Ur et-Tahta, I am unable to discover, but I am inclined to think that it refers to a steep valley which branches off from Wady Selman just west of Beit Ur el-Fauqa, giving an approach to that town and also answering well to the 'ascent' or 'descent' (depending on which way one is going, I suppose). The approach to Beit Ur et-Tahta is a broader and flatter valley near the Shephelah town of Harebat el-Musbah and does not seem to answer to an 'ascent.' In any case, it does not make a great deal of difference for our purposes to define exactly where the 'ascent' is to be located. It is sufficient to remember that somewhere in the region of the Beth-Horons 'Jehovah cast down great stones from heaven upon them (the Amorites) unto Azekah' (v.¹¹). In this connexion we may observe also that if a hail-storm arose at this point in the fight, then the probability is that no one could see the sun or moon stand still thereafter because

¹ *Foundations of Bible History: Joshua, Judges* (Harper, 1931).

of the clouded sky. Whatever 'standing still' there was must have taken place between Gibeon and the 'ascent of Beth-Horon,' that is, in the narrow, gorge-like part of Wady Selman which connects the plateau of the highlands with the Shephelah.

Before the experiment of reproducing the essentials of the long day could be carried out, it was necessary to know just where in the region of Gibeon to go and at what time. It is to be observed, therefore, that the following circumstances seem well substantiated by the Biblical account :

Both sun and moon were near the horizon at the time when they stood still. The words of the text are, 'Sun, stand thou still *upon* Gibeon ; and thou, Moon, *in* the valley of Aijalon,' both the italicized prepositions being the same preposition of location in the original. If the luminaries were, let us suppose, somewhere near the zenith, then they could hardly be spoken of as being 'upon' or 'in' any spot of the landscape. For such reference to places on the earth, they must have been reasonably near the horizon of the earth.

Furthermore, the incident must have occurred not far from the time of full moon. The only way in which both sun and moon can be visible when both are near the horizon is when they are approximately opposite each other ; that is, at full moon. If they should both be near the same part of the horizon, the moon would not be visible at all.

It must have been sunrise. The valley of Aijalon lies west of Gibeon, so that the only way in which one could tell the sun to stand upon Gibeon, and the moon in the valley of Aijalon, would be to take one's position between the two places, with Gibeon to the east and Aijalon to the west. The sun would then be rising and the moon setting. This time of day fits in with the account of Joshua's forced march from Gilgal all night (v.⁷). By so doing he was able to reach the highlands and the plain of Gibeon by dawn, when he surprised the enemy by his swift movements and put them to flight. It is also to be noticed that if it were approximately full moon, his night march would have been very much more feasible than otherwise.

The time was only approximately full moon. If it were exactly full moon, then the moon would disappear as the sun arose and there would be no chance for the moon, at least, to play its part in standing still. So a little allowance had to be made and the time set for one or two days after full moon. It could not be before full moon, because the moon would disappear before sunrise in that case.

The plan was, then, to go to the scene of the battle near Gibeon at dawn one or two days after full moon, and as the sun arose, to run down the valley of Aijalon or Wady Selman as fast as we may imagine the Hebrews chased the Amorites—which must have been about as fast as they could go, considering it was a life-and-death matter. By so doing it ought to be possible, on this theory, to keep the sun on the apparent horizon in the direction of Gibeon (the apparent horizon changing, as one runs, to compensate for the motion of the sun), and at the same time to keep the moon visible in the valley of Aijalon as that valley opens westward toward the Shephelah. If the experiment should yield a reasonable degree of success as far as the region of the 'ascent of Beth-Horon,' there would be no need to go farther, for here the hail-storm arose.

In January 1935 I made my first trip to the region to learn the topography of the country and make plans. With an Arab guide I went to El-Jib and down Wady Selman to Beit Nuba and Yalo. I was impressed by the directness of the route which Wady Selman provides to the Shephelah, and also with the manifest fact that a fleeing army would be very much hemmed in by the gorge-like valley until it reached the Shephelah, when it could scatter in different directions. On the whole, the topography, which has been described above, seemed to encourage the experiment.

The undertaking was not without difficulties. The weather had to be fair at just the right time. There was the difficulty of getting to El-Jib by dawn without exhausting oneself by walking a good portion of the night. To be sure, Joshua and his men did just that, but they were in better training for that sort of life than most moderns. Also, it seemed very unwise for any one, least of all a stranger to the land, to undertake such a trip alone, and it was asking a good deal of any one else to be at El-Jib at dawn in order to run five or six miles over the rough, stony ground of a Palestinian wady. But the difficulties were all overcome. I found a kindred spirit in Rev. C. C. duHeaume (C.M.S., Jerusalem), and we made the trip on March 23rd, 1935. Mrs. Ellis (also of the C.M.S.) was kind enough to offer the use of her motor-car, so that we were able to get to the desired spot in good time without having to walk in the night. She drove back after leaving us a short distance from El-Jib. We arrived at the plain just west of El-Jib before dawn and took our place in a low part of the plain just north of the El-Jib—El-Qubeiba road, with a large modern cistern a short

distance farther north of us. We were near the path which leads from El-Jib to the upper end of Wady Selman, the path being between us and the cistern. This place in the plain offered us the best opportunity of seeing the sun and moon in the desired positions, and also answered to the probable site of the beginning of the pursuit of the routed Amorites. As we stood there, the moon, slightly past the full, was beautifully visible in the west over the hills which lie alongside Wady Selman or the valley of Aijalon, and the pink of dawn coloured the horizon in the east, with El-Jib or Gibeon in the foreground. We ate a few oranges as breakfast to sustain us for the chase without burdening the digestion. Then the disc of the sun began to appear a little north of the *tel* or mound of El-Jib—not exactly ‘upon’ it mathematically, but sufficiently so for our purposes. It rose with startling rapidity. As soon as it was fully visible, we recalled the words of Joshua as given in the Biblical narrative, ‘Sun, stand thou still upon Gibeon; and thou, Moon, in the valley of Aijalon,’ and then started the chase. It took a few minutes to get up over the low brow of the hill which divides the plain adjacent to El-Jib from the upper end of Wady Selman. As we plunged down into the valley both sun and moon disappeared from view for the time being. But as we kept on running, a look back would occasionally reveal the sun just rising toward the upper end of the valley. When we got to the part of the valley which lies between the approaches to the two Beth-Horons, that is, almost to the Shephelah, in the region where the hail-storm arose, there was the sun still just rising over the visible horizon in the eastward direction of Gibeon—it had ‘stood still’ perfectly! But the moon was not so obliging. It was in its proper place at the beginning of the chase, but once I lost sight of it when we plunged into the valley, it did not appear again to view. Once or twice I thought I saw it, but doubtless it was imagination. At the lower end of the valley I ran on into the open Shephelah in hope of seeing it again, but it must have set by that time. The experiment was, therefore, not wholly a success, although it was very rewarding as far as the sun was concerned. Foot-sore, blistered, and exhausted, we rested a while before making our way over to Bab ul-Wad for a motor-bus to Jerusalem.

The next thing to do was to look into the matter of the moon standing still. In the experiment its position relative to the sun and to the valley of Aijalon was quite satisfactory, so that there would be no further need of considering the sun. It

would only be necessary to discover whether the moon, seen in that same position from the plain of El-Jib, at the start of the run, could be made to ‘stand still’ as far as the ‘ascent of Beth-Horon.’ Our previous lack of complete success in this regard seemed to be due to two factors. One was that we may not have allowed sufficiently for the motion of the moon. As one stands in the plain of Gibeon from where we started our run, the western apparent horizon offers a slight advantage in being a little higher than the true horizon, so that the moon appeared nearer the horizon at the start than it really was. But this advantage was less than I had hoped, for the apparent horizon at the lower end of the valley is likewise higher than the true horizon. Thus I may have counted too much on this slight advantage and not made sufficient allowance for the motion of the moon. The other factor was haze. The day on which we made the run was almost as clear as could be desired, but nevertheless it is surprising how even the slightest haze may conceal the moon after the sun is up, especially at the horizon. After observing the moon at its daytime setting a few times, I decided that it was going to be practically useless to try to keep track of such a fading luminary while running down a valley. It would be so elusive that the time lost in trying to locate it would offset the time gained by running and thus make the experiment end in failure. It seemed more to the point to substitute sun for moon and run down the valley at sunset, for the sun is always sufficiently brilliant to be seen on a reasonably clear day, and for the purposes of the experiment the substitution would not make any difference, for both luminaries set at approximately the same place in the west. Accordingly, on June 10th I ran down the valley in the evening. When I reached the plain of Gibeon, the sun was about where the moon had been in the west on the day of the previous running. It was about an hour before actual sunset. As I ran down the valley the setting sun appeared in the westward angle of the valley again and again, at least four times. Just as I came to the hill beyond which lies the ‘ascent of Beth-Horon’ (I refer to Upper Beth-Horon), I had the last view of the sun. After that the crimson glow alone was visible. I had not quite reached the place where previously the sun had ‘stood still’ to its greatest effect—I did not seem to make quite as good time in running as at first—but I had run practically as far, and quite far enough to satisfy myself that a setting luminary could be made to ‘stand still’ in the valley of Aijalon under the proper conditions.

The problem remains : If the moon was too faint to be seen 'standing still' in the valley, necessitating the substitution of the sun for experimental purposes, how can we suppose that Joshua was able to see it in the first instance? The answer would seem to lie in weather conditions. It is quite conceivable that the clouds which resulted in the hail-storm were gathering long before the ascent of Beth-Horon was reached by the Hebrews ; gathering, let us say, as *cumulus nimbus*, increasingly covering the sky, but leaving the horizons clear toward both east and west, as I have seen happen at Jerusalem. As the sun would advance into the clouds toward totally disappearing, and as the clouds above would reduce the degree of daylight, the setting moon may very well have appeared brighter than under ordinary circumstances, and thus visible to the pursuing Hebrews. However, regardless of weather conditions, it remains true that a setting luminary may be kept in the line of visibility as one runs down the valley of Aijalon.

To the Hebrew mind all the phenomena of Nature and history were assigned directly to the final cause of divine purpose. We may well imagine, then, how such an incident would be regarded as a very marked token of divine assistance. It would be so striking in lending colour to the victory over the Amorites that it would be celebrated by the poets and minstrels of ancient Israel on all occasions and thus find its rightful place in the Yashar collection. In fact, it is just the kind of dramatic occurrence which would appeal most to popular religious imagination. Certainly it would be sufficiently unusual for it to be said that 'there

was no day like that before it or after it, that Jehovah hearkened unto the voice of man.' As far as the length of the long day is concerned, although we would have to take exception to the idea of the actual day being lengthened (10^{13b}), both because of our knowledge of the movements of the heavenly bodies, and because all that Joshua did after the battle near Gibeon is humanly possible of accomplishment within one day of daylight, yet it is also true that Joshua and his men, by their swift action and physical endurance, accomplished the work of two average days within one, making a forced march all night and then pursuing the Amorites all the next day to points as far as Azekah and Makkedah. After 'chasing the Amorites' over only a portion of that distance, Mr. duHeaume and I were sufficiently exhausted to regard those Hebrews of Joshua's day with profound admiration. If this explanation of the Joshuanic solstice seems too involved, let us remember that the simplest experiences are often the most involved in analysis ; that the common man in ancient Israel, living the simple life of nomad or shepherd, was probably far more aware of the behaviour of the heavenly bodies than we who live in modern cities ; and that such an incident could have taken place just as spontaneously as my own experience of chasing a morning shadow in the Himalayas. It is quite probable that Joshua was just as eager to 'avenge himself of his enemies' thoroughly before reaching the open Shephelah, where they could scatter, as I was to reach a motor road, and that there was a race with the sun in his case as there was in mine.

The Contribution of Judaism and Christianity to the Drama.

BY THE REVEREND G. S. JOHNSTONE, FRASERBURGH.

IN tracing the history of the drama most critics find its first connexion with the Christian Church in the Morality Plays. Many take it for granted that these plays were simply written to meet the needs of an illiterate people, rather than the result of a long series of influences which find their roots in the beginning of religion. Drama is the art of

expression by action. Religion in its most primitive form revealed itself not as a moral standard of life, but rather as a conforming of its devotees to prescribed forms of action which was called worship. The sacrifice of human beings and animals, which was the really important part in primitive religions, was a drama acted according to a definite plan.

The ceremony was carefully carried out and the priests and people played a definite rôle. The pageantry of dress, music, singing, and dancing was introduced to give atmosphere to the actual drama of sacrifice. The priests were given the chief parts; their function was the acting of various parts which showed the people their sacrifices were successful in appeasing their gods.

The first outstanding religious drama we meet in the Old Testament is the representation of the deliverance of Israel from the Egyptians by the Passover Feast. The household ceremony took the dramatic form of sprinkling the blood of a sacrificed animal on the door-posts and the eating (standing prepared for a journey) of roasted meat and unleavened bread with bitter herbs. This feast is characteristic of Judaistic worship. With the exception of a few choice souls, worship to the majority in the Old Testament is not the individual communion of spirit with Spirit, but the participation of the individual with the people in a clearly defined ritual. As time went on, worship became more intricately developed, until we find that the observance of ritual has become worship. The means has become an end. The Jews dramatized every event in their history which had special religious significance, describing them under such nomenclature as Feasts or Fasts.

Even the prophets, who strongly opposed this formalism, adopted the drama to express their message. There is this slight difference, that while the earlier dramatic form called for the services of many people, the form used by the prophets required only the service of one. The prophet himself was the actor who played the leading rôle. Most of them chose the oracle as their medium, and this was a dramatic poem. The prophecy of Nahum is a typical example. His pen seems dipped in vitriol, and he presents a flaming picture of the destruction of Nineveh. It is so active in expression that his words seem to leap from the page, and we are swept away on a mighty current of hate to gloat upon the annihilation of a mighty empire.

The shield of his mighty men is made red,
The valiant men are in scarlet:
The chariots shall be with flaming torches in the day
of his preparation,
And the fir trees shall be terribly shaken.
The chariots shall rage in the streets,
They shall jostle one against another in the broad
ways:
They shall seem like torches,
They shall run like the lightnings.

The noise of a whip, and the noise of the rattling of
the wheels,
And of the prancing horses, and of the jumping chariots.
The horseman lifteth up both the bright sword and the
glittering spear:
And there is a multitude of slain, and a great number
of carcases:
And there is none end of corpses:
They stumble upon their corpses.

That example is typical of the whole book and is obviously cast in dramatic form. Other prophets were not satisfied with a dramatic style of speaking or writing, they went into the crowded places and acted their message. Before the 'ancients' of the people Jeremiah played the leading rôle in the play of 'The Potter's Earthen Bottle.' Even the parable of the linen girdle is a short drama. There could be nothing more dramatic than the statesman and prophet Isaiah walking in public 'unfrosted and barefoot' for three years uttering this solemn warning, 'So shall the king of Assyria lead away the captives of Egypt, stripped and barefoot.' It is generally accepted to-day that one of the greatest dramas of all time is the Book of Job.

On coming to the New Testament we find that the drama is still used as a vehicle for conveying the Divine message. Jesus Christ was not only a great poet (cf. the Sermon on the Mount), a great story-teller (cf. parables), but He was also a great dramatist. His miracles were dramatic representations of His message, otherwise the story of His Temptation has no point. The drama of calming the Sea of Galilee proclaimed His power over Nature; the drama of healing the sick proclaimed His power over disease; the drama of raising the Widow of Nain's Son proclaimed His power over death. His use of drama is further exemplified in His founding of the Church, making baptism the gateway to membership, and the Last Supper the bond of fellowship and remembrance. Baptism is a dramatic picture of the disciples being buried with Christ and being resurrected with Him to walk in newness of life. The fellowship of the Christian Church is revealed in the symbolic acts of eating and drinking the bread and wine.

The writer of the Fourth Gospel casts his whole narrative into dramatic form. This Gospel begins with a prologue which strikes an ominous note at the beginning—'He came unto his own, and his own received him not.' We are aware at the commencement that we are about to read a tragedy. 'The Prologue is a prelude to a drama in which the protagonists are Jesus, the Word of God, and the evil powers of Darkness and Unbelief,' says R. H.

Strachan in his book, *The Fourth Evangelist*, 16. We find, too, in this Gospel an extensive use of dramatic irony which heightens the effect similar to the use of the Porter Scene in *Macbeth* by Shakespeare. We read, 'Judas went out and it was night'; or, 'The Romans will come and take away our nation.' In both cases it was true, and the truth casts a terrible light upon both characters. A verse like this—'It was expedient that one man should die for the people'—has the same effect upon deepening the atmosphere of tragedy as the sleep-walking scene in *Macbeth*, when Lady Macbeth mutters in her dream, 'Wash your hands, put on your night-gown; look not so pale. I tell you yet again, Banquo's buried; he cannot come out on's grave.' Step by step the plot is built up until the feeling of tragedy becomes intolerable as it reaches its climax in the Passion story. 'The hour is come' is like the sounding of a knell, tolling before its time for the death of Christ. Surely one of the greatest contributions that Christianity has made to the drama has been the Fourth Gospel.

The Christian Church further contributed to the development of the drama in three ways—the Mass, the Morality Plays, and the Sermon. The contact of the Early Church with the pagan world led to a development of ritual in the Church services, and soon the simple form of worship as practised by the Primitive Church gave way to a highly developed ritualistic one. The development of a hierarchy greatly assisted this movement, since it found its support in the Old Testament Levitical Order. The two sacraments ordered by Christ, Baptism and the Lord's Supper, suffered great changes. The Eucharist ceased to be a simple sacramental meal and became, what it is known as to-day in the Roman Communion, the Mass. The Mass became the greatest pageant that the Church had to offer, and the chief actors in this religious drama were the officiating priests; the congregation which was formerly participants became spectators in this Church festival. The second great religious drama which Christianity gave to the world was the Mass.

From the Mass to the Morality Plays was a short step, since the Plays merely perpetuated an idea which was firmly established in Christian tradition. When the Church had grown in power and was dominating the world, the demand for dramatic expression, above all for the illiterate, became urgent; the pagan festivals, with their essentially

dramatic potentialities, still lingered in popular tradition. To meet the demand, the Church began to produce religious plays which were actually part of the liturgy, hence the name *mystery*, or the better name *ministry*, plays. Incidents like the rolling the stone away from the tomb and the representation of the manger in Bethlehem at Christmas-time were dramatized, and the latter was introduced into the Mass itself. The distinct contribution of the Morality Plays is recognized by all dramatic critics.

The sermon, although in a class by itself in literature, has more affinity with the drama than any other literary form. It is not an essay, since it is more than a reasoned descriptive statement; it is an oral challenge. Neither is it a novel, for it has a definite structure and time limit. It is like the drama and can be a drama which has a definite plot or plan and must have a beginning, a middle, and an end. The drama is limited by time, since it must be acted within a given period of time; one can hardly think of the average drama as the famous Oberammergau Morality Play, which lasts a week. The sermon suffers even more strongly from this limitation and the people usually expect delivery to last not longer than thirty minutes. Then the drama has this in common with the sermon that it is not written to be read, but both require the medium of human personality to convey the message to the audience. The sermon and the drama are at the mercy of their living interpreters who can, and very often do, ruin a good piece of writing. Their aim is very similar, since they both seek to portray the reactions of human nature to the varied natural circumstances; but there is this difference that while the drama is a picture of human character which can leave out of account God or gods, the sermon can never take this liberty.

These striking similarities lead one to suppose that both are indebted to each other. Yet the Ministry Plays were simply a more dramatic form of the sermons; they had common aims and common material. The Plays would make a stronger appeal to the eye than the preacher would, and so would be found more useful in gripping an illiterate congregation of people. It is not too much to suggest that the Mass and the Sermon were together instrumental in producing the first Morality Plays of the Church.

Contributions and Comments.

The Possible Mention of Joshua's Conquest in the El-Amarna Letters.

IN Professor T. H. Robinson's article on 'The Date of the Exodus,' in the November number of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, p. 55, there occurs this statement in regard to the El-Amarna Letters: 'We lack the really direct evidence which would have been afforded to us by a mention of Joshua or of the loss of any cities taken by him.' One wonders whether Professor Robinson has overlooked the fact that in Letter No. 256 of Knudtzon's translation there is a reference to a Jeshua which seems clearly to be the equivalent of Joshua, and also to a Biennima which might well be the Biblical Benjamin. The tablet is translated also on p. 447 of the sixth edition of my *Archæology and the Bible* (Phila., 1933). Professor A. T. Olmstead in his *History of Palestine and Syria* (N.Y., 1931, pp. 188 and 197) also discusses these names. The letter concerns the king of Pella, whose name was Aiab, or Job, and refers to a number of cities that had become hostile to the Egyptian domination. It appears from the fact that the king is advised to ask this Joshua concerning the city of Ashtar (the Ashtoreth-Karnaim of the Bible) that Joshua was a man of military power and influence who was at the moment in the East Jordan country.

If this Joshua is identical with the Biblical Joshua it is possible that he preceded Moses and that traditions that were ultimately embodied in the Bible had lost the true chronological perspective.

GEORGE A. BARTON.

University of Pennsylvania.

I should like to express my sincere thanks to the Editor of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES for the courtesy which allowed me to see Dr. Barton's note before it appeared. It was neither by accident nor through any lack of respect for Dr. Barton that I failed to mention the reference he quotes in the letter of Mut-Ba'lu to Ianhamu. It is impossible either to include every point or to explain reasons for omission in a brief article, but if readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES feel that they have been in any way misled by my statement, I hope that they will accept my apologies. The high standing of Pro-

fessor Barton and Professor Olmstead—and I yield to no one in my appreciation of their position and of their work—makes it difficult to disagree with them, but I am bound to say that I am unable to see any connexion between the Iashua of the letter in question and the Biblical Joshua. In the first place I am by no means convinced that the places mentioned in this letter really were east of Jordan; Aiab's city is called in the letter Bihisi (so read by Knudtzon, Weber, and Ebeling), which may be Pella, but looks unlike it (the Egyptian form of Pella, on a monument of Seti I., is PHR—Egyptian R = Semitic L—), and there seem to be good grounds for placing the whole district concerned in southern and south-western Judah (see Weber's notes in Knudtzon, vol. ii. pp. 131 ff.). Nor can I agree with Professor Olmstead that 'Benenima is a perfectly good Benjamin' (*History of Palestine and Syria*, p. 158). But, even allowing for all this, the Iashua of the letter is clearly either an Egyptian official or a petty local ruler trusted by the king's commissioner, Ianhamu (not the king himself). To identify him with the Biblical Joshua is to abandon all hope of placing any reliance whatever on the traditions of Israel as preserved for us in the earlier books of the Bible. We are all too ready to accept identification of Biblical persons with those mentioned in the ancient documents, and our most dogmatic statements should be accepted with some reserve unless they are supported by indisputable evidence.

T. H. ROBINSON.

University College, Cardiff.

The Exile and the Return: & Correction.

My attention has recently been called to certain passages in J. Battersby Harford's *Studies in the Book of Ezekiel* (Cambridge Press, 1935). I read on p. 21: 'For the last twenty years Torrey has sought to prove that the whole theory of a Babylonian Exile and Return is pure fiction. *The Book of Ezekiel, as it stands, blocks the way*' (the italics are mine). 'He must therefore show that the author never lived in Babylonia and that all

the prophecies have their scene in Judah and Jerusalem.' And on p. 22 the following is given out as my representation: 'The Jews found it hard to refute this theory [the Samaritan claim], but at last they hit upon an ingenious plan. They invented the Babylonian Exile. A body of Jews with priests at their head, they said, had been deported to Babylonia.'

Since these very hurtful statements rest on misunderstanding, I ask leave to make a correction. I am aware that the same mistake has been made by other scholars who have mentioned my work in this field, and I have no doubt that Canon Battersby Harford supposed himself to have reliable authority for his belief.

I hold no opinion, nor have ever entertained any theory, as to the Babylonian Exile, which could in the least be disturbed by the recognition of the Book of Ezekiel as a genuine prophecy written by one of the Jewish exiles in Babylonia. The fact of the Exile is perfectly attested, and I have never at any time questioned it; nor have I doubted that priests and 'elders' were among those deported. My opinion as to the trustworthiness of the Chronicler's great 'history' has nothing to do with these facts.

Nor is it otherwise with my criticism of Second Isaiah (since Harford mentions this in the same connexion). In the first complete statement of my view as to the so-called Return (*Comp. and Hist. Value of Ezra-Neh.*, 1896), Ezekiel was not considered at all, and Second Isaiah only in a sentence (p. 56) that took for granted the mention of Cyrus by the prophet.

CHARLES C. TORREY.

Yale University.

Song of Songs ii. 17 (iv. 6) and Isaiah xl. 3.

It is a pity that Dr. Buchanan Blake, in his comments on these two passages, makes no reference to the Revised Version which, in both cases, supports his view. A word of appreciation and acknowledgment of this oft-neglected version would not have been out of place.

'Until the day be cool' is the rendering in Ca 2¹⁷ and 4⁶. The marginal reference, 'Heb. breathe,' is suggestive, especially to those who have lived in tropical or semi-tropical countries.

In Is 40³ we read, 'The voice of one that crieth, Prepare ye in the wilderness,' etc.

Hebrew parallelism, too, confirms Dr. Blake's interpretation of both verses:

Until the day be cool:

[Until] the shadows (due to the sun) flee away;
I will get me to the mountain of myrrh:
[I will get me] to the hill of frankincense.

The voice of one that crieth:

Prepare ye in the wilderness the way of the Lord:
Make straight in the desert a high way for our God.

The Revised Version in these, as in many other instances, helps the ordinary reader to attach the meaning justified by the Hebrew text.

GEORGE GIFFORD.

Helston.

Saint Peter's Denials.

MIGHT I submit here a case for the Fourth Gospel being more historically accurate and preferable to the Synoptics?

Let us first note the sequence of the narrative in St. John. At the arrest of Jesus the disciples had fled. Two of them, recovering from their panic, had afterwards followed Jesus afar off. One was Simon Peter, the other was 'another disciple'—traditionally, St. John. This other disciple was known to the high priest sufficiently well to be admitted to the servants' courtyard. It does not follow that he was a personal friend of Annas or Caiaphas, or of the same social class, for the narrative, as Sanday points out, might well be told from the standpoint of the servants' hall. Peter remains without. The other disciple, therefore, goes out, speaks to the damsel that kept the door, and brings in Peter. Therefore the damsel says to Peter, 'Surely you are not one of the disciples of this man?' *οὐν* is causal, suggesting that she already knew the other to be a disciple, and therefore expected Peter to be. The form of the question, expecting a negative answer, was therefore in the nature of a sneer. In his eagerness to get in Peter does not realise that a truthful answer would not have excluded him. In order to gain admission to the courtyard, as it seems to him, he denies Jesus. How typically human! Are our first denials of Jesus not made to gain admission to some company, to some place, or to some friendship that seems desirable in our eyes, and which we may imagine may even bring us nearer to our Lord?

Peter joins the servants round the fire. His

friend, more reserved and distant, stands in the shadows watching. The narrative bears all the marks of an eye-witness's story—an eye-witness who was not a participant. The night is cold. The trial continues within hearing and also within sight of the servants' courtyard. An officer strikes Jesus; our Lord takes it meekly. A ripple of scorn runs round the fire. Peter stands and warms himself. He is challenged. 'Are you not one of that man's disciples?'—as if to say, 'That's the kind of unmanly meekness you've been following!' Peter is scandalised—he denies Him. The meekness of Jesus suffering quietly a personal insult offends Peter. Is the second great human reason for the denial of Jesus not that, in our Lord's own words, we are scandalized at much in Him—at His attitude to personal suffering? The sequence of the narrative in this Gospel shows this to be the reason for Peter's second denial.

Then Peter is identified. A kinsman of Malchus identifies him, and challenges him. The striker of Malchus was obviously in danger for some years afterwards. Peter faced with this accusation realises his own peril. He denies Jesus again. This time it is for the sake of his own personal safety. The cock crew.

The Fourth Gospel tells us no more. It omits any reference to the vehemence of Peter's denials,

which an observer at a little distance would not appreciate. The story here ceases where the 'other disciple's' witness would also cease. Only here have we a clear account of the denials, of his progressive fall, and the separate reason for each step.

The Synoptics are not even consistent with themselves. St. Matthew mentions two maids. St. Mark, one. St. Luke places the lapse of time between the second and third denials. But all alike emphasize the vehemence of the denials of Jesus, and of Peter's repentance and tears. St. Luke tells us that our Lord turned and looked on Peter. The interest of the Synoptics is in the emotions of Peter rather than in the events. They emphasize what Peter would emphasize, and show signs of confusion where Peter in telling the story repeatedly might be expected to become confused. The participator in such events can rarely give a clear account of what happened—his own mental upheaval preoccupies him. It is the spectator who sees most.

Is there not internal evidence that in St. John's Gospel we have the carefully preserved or accurately recorded witness of that 'other disciple,' and that, so far as it goes, it is historically preferable to the account in the Synoptics?

J. RAMSAY THOMSON.

Applegarth, Lockerbie.

Entre Nous.

Alington of Eton.

The Dean of Durham has written a delightful book of reminiscences to which he has given the title *Things Ancient and Modern* (Longmans; 22s. 6d. net). There is nothing of the set autobiography in it although we have an account of his schooldays, his posts at Marlborough, Eton, and Shrewsbury, and his sixteen years' Headmastership of Eton. The bulk of the book consists of Dr. Alington's views on the public-school system and his programme of educational reform. A classicist himself, he sees clearly the mistakes of the classical party. We are never long under any misapprehension as to his own bent. On page 52 we find the following generalization, which may well cause some heartburning. 'If as Head Master I wanted some piece of work done, I should feel safer if I

entrusted it to a mathematician or to an Oxford classic: fairly safe if my classic came from Cambridge: but profoundly uneasy if I had to give it to a scientist. No doubt there are brilliant exceptions, just as there may be women with artistic gifts, or men with feminine practicality, but roughly speaking I believe this (typically Oxonian) generalization to be true.' But it appeared clear to him that the mistake at public schools was that it was not frankly recognized that there are two main types of boys—the literary and the scientific. The boy whose interest lies primarily in literature must be given some knowledge of science, but in a different way from that which is rightly ordained for his scientific brother. He must get some knowledge of scientific results and have an inkling of the method by which they were obtained, but it is quite

unnecessary for him to break test-tubes in his efforts to obtain a smattering of chemistry. And if his scientific and mathematical colleagues will let the literary boy off practical chemistry and off algebra, Dr. Alington, in his turn, is prepared to let the scientific boy off Latin prose. 'I should propose to ask the non-literary boy to learn his Latin grammar with a view not to composition, but to reading.' Where one classical language only is to be studied, Dr. Alington gives the preference to Greek. Instead of struggling through Cæsar and Nepos and Ovid he would have the boy turn to the Greeks. 'The great Greeks are gloriously simple, partly because of the lucidity of their language, and partly because of the clarity of their thought, and for a boy to have even a bowing acquaintance with Homer, Herodotus, Aristophanes and Plato is to open out new literary horizons such as Keats beheld when he first "heard Chapman speak out loud and bold."'

'I can testify,' he says, 'from practical experience that it is possible to get a boy who knows no Greek to read these authors with intelligence and appreciation in two years by six hours' work a week in school.'

'Here, then, is my programme for the scientific boy: he should learn Latin (or preferably Greek) grammar, and be able to construe his chosen classical language with reasonable fluency and accuracy, but should make no attempts at composition in it. He should learn, at some time in his career, a modern language: he should be taught history and English, and would probably be able to give to them some of the time saved from classical composition: for the rest, let him have as much science and mathematics as his instructors wish to give him, and of the type which, in their wisdom, they deem best. My strictures upon time wasted in the laboratory have, of course, no relevance in his case.'

There are topics on which some will feel that Dr. Alington does not go far enough. Speaking of the O.T.C., for example, he admits that so far as physical training is concerned, the time could be better spent, but he goes on, 'Of one thing I am perfectly certain, and that is that the O.T.C. does not encourage militarism.' There may be dissenters too from his views on corporal punishment. 'Personally, I have no qualms about corporal punishment, which, if properly administered, has the inestimable advantage of a quick settling of the business and leaves no resentment behind in the mind of a normal boy. . . . Perhaps I may be allowed a footnote of personal experience. On one occasion it fell to my lot to have a boy to breakfast one morning, to beat

him (with his entire consent) an hour or two later for an offence undiscovered when the invitation was issued, and to play fives with him before luncheon. This was an engagement made a day or two before, and neither of us saw the least reason for cancelling it. No one who cannot understand that story has any claim to a knowledge of the English public schoolboy—or his master.' That is as it may be. But no one could fail to enjoy the humour in this volume, its tolerant spirit, and its sanity.

Dr. Alington belongs, as he says, to the two most criticised professions, for a clerical schoolmaster offers four cheeks to the smiter. While retaining all the educational chapters, we wish that he had given us more on religion. There is only one chapter devoted to it. But what we have is extremely suggestive, and Dr. Alington explains the smallness of the space because in three previous books—'Elementary Christianity,' 'Doubts and Difficulties,' 'The Fool Hath Said'—he had expounded his religious convictions.

In this chapter he has something to say on the ever-recurring difficulty of the opposition of science and religion. He uses the simile of a jigsaw puzzle, the workers on which may fail to see any connexion between the parts at which they are severally working. 'We shall not know the full answer until the picture is completely finished: all that we can do is, in our respective spheres, to fit together those pieces of the puzzle which undoubtedly cohere, and to insist that they must find a place in the whole when it is ultimately completed. . . . To develop this simile a little, Christians are bound to believe that in the centre of a completed picture there will be found a Figure on a Cross, but that Figure will not be seen in its true glory until the flowers in the foreground and the clouds in the background have each been fitted into their place. The picture at which we are working is, we are bound to believe, a coherent whole in which each detail has its value and its meaning.'

Science, he reiterates, is concerned with the question How: religion is concerned with the question Why. 'The difference is perhaps most clearly seen in the sphere of art. Science, if it looks at a great picture, can tell you how the pigments have been made and can explain the effect of the various colours on the eye, but it is not interested in the question why one picture is a mere daub and another a masterpiece. Similarly, in the field of music, science can do much to explain the mysterious processes by which sounds reach the brain, and the mechanism by which such sounds are produced; but it is not concerned with the problem why some

combinations of sound have the power to stir human nature to its depths. Browning may have been wrong when he saw in such results

"The finger of God, a flash of the will that can,"

enabling a musician "out of three sounds to frame, not a fourth, but a star," but in any case the process is one with which science, as such, has no concern. Again, to take a still simpler illustration, the mystery of poetry is one outside the scientific ken: science can tell you the origin of words, but the scientific man, in his purely scientific capacity, can give you no explanation why we are so deeply stirred by such simple phrases as

Old unhappy far-off things
And battles long ago

or wherein lies the magic of the lines:

But at my back I always hear
Time's winged chariot hurrying near,
And yonder all before us lie
Deserts of vast eternity.

'The fact is that we have allowed ourselves to be hypnotized by the marvellous achievements of science into forgetting how large a part of human life and human interest lies outside its purview. The questions which most of us take an interest in discussing, such as the relative merits of our favourite authors or composers, or the beauties of nature and art, are completely outside its range.'

Selfish Mistakes.

'The heart of every Head Master knoweth its own bitterness, but I may be forgiven for thinking that the six whom we lost were among the most remarkable of their profession. Two of them, Malcolm White and Evelyn Southwell, were commemorated in a small volume privately printed, called *Two Men*, which I take leave to regard as one of the most vivid of war records.' White in his last letter to his family wrote: 'It seems to me that, if I die in this action, it gives me a great simple chance of making up for a lot of selfishness in the past, and when I want to reconcile myself to the idea of not coming back again, I just think of all those selfish mistakes I've made, and I am almost glad of the opportunity to put them right. That's my view of it. It is not priggish—I hope it doesn't sound like that.'¹

The Spiritual Field.

'A parent walking round the grounds once said to me, "What a wonderful field you have here, Mr. Alington!" Anxious to show how up-to-date

¹ C. A. Alington, *Things Ancient and Modern*, 141.

we were, I explained that the cricket pitch was just being treated with the newest preparation. It was distressing to us both to find that he was alluding to the spiritual field.'²

Professor Dodd on the Atonement.

Professor Dodd in *The Parables of the Kingdom* has a searching comment in one place on the *theological problem of the Atonement*. He has no doubt that Jesus foresaw and predicted His own death. And just as certainly He proclaimed that God's Kingdom had come and was now in being, an impact upon the world of the powers of the world to come. His death, therefore, did not bring in the Kingdom and was not a piece of the Kingdom or a way of making its coming morally possible. It was itself a result and proof of the Kingdom being there. If then for Paul the Cross was the manifestation of the righteousness of God, it was because he had understood this. The death of Jesus had been part of the effective assertion of God's sovereign rule. It is the fact that Christ's death fell within the 'Kingdom of God' that compels the formulation of what Paul called a 'word of the cross.' To have the Cross as an accident of history is not only to turn from Pauline theology but from Jesus' own teaching regarding the relation between the coming of the Kingdom and His own death.

Pentecostal Power.

If we study the first three chapters of the Acts with some care, we shall find that two things are closely allied: the new surge of power, that quickening of the being which came to the company of Christians gathered in Jerusalem, and their facing the social tasks of their time. The point most often forgotten is this: the disciples received the Pentecostal power when they faced the Pentecostal task. What the experience seems to teach is a lesson of enormous significance for the Church of our day and of any day, that God gives power only to men who need it. He gives it to those who have tackled something so big, so overwhelming, that their own resources are quite insufficient. Such a tackling of a task too big for human power is the opening of the door through which there comes the rushing of a mighty wind of the spirit.³

² C. A. Alington, *Things Ancient and Modern*, 156.

³ H. E. Luccock, *Christian Faith and Economic Change*, 201.

Printed by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, Kings Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.